

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CX. JANUARY 1903.

ART. I.—THE THREE CHURCHES IN
IRELAND.

1. *History of the Church of Ireland from the Reformation to the Union.* By RICHARD MANT, D.D. (London: 1840.)
2. *The Reformed Church of Ireland, 1537–1886.* By the Rt. Hon. J. T. BALL. (London: 1886.)
3. *The Constitution and Canons of the Church of Ireland.* Edited by Archdeacon SCOTT and Sir J. C. MEREDITH. (Dublin: 1899.)
4. *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland from the Earliest Period.* By W. D. PULLEN. (London: 1895.)
5. *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.* By J. S. REID, D.D. (Edinburgh: 1839.)
6. *A History of the Irish Presbyterians.* By WILLIAM THOMAS LATIMER. (Belfast: 1902.)
7. *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the Year 1829.* By the Rev. M. J. BRENNAN, O.S.J. (Dublin: 1864.)
8. *Annals of Ireland.* By the FOUR MASTERS. (Dublin: 1846.)

OUR purpose in this article is to glance at the history, the characteristics, and the present condition of the organizations that maintain the Christian faith in Ireland. The figure of Patrick shines amidst a halo of legends, but he was certainly

VOL. LV.—NO. CX.

S

the founder of the primitive Irish Church ; he was a missionary saint of great genius ; he probably purged the laws of Pagan Ireland from much that was bad and inhuman. From the middle of the fifth to the ninth century the early Church of Ireland had a remarkable history, and was illustrated with a glory peculiar to it. Its holy men preached the Word in many parts of Europe : Columba spread the light of the Gospel in heathen Scotland ; Irish priests made their influence felt in Northumbria and Wales ; Irish missionaries were welcome at the board of Charles the Great, and told the tidings of great joy to barbarians in the Jura, and along the Main and the Rhine. And Ireland in those ages was a place of refuge for thousands of Christians abandoning the wrecks of the dying world of Rome ; for Merovingian kings and for bishops and monks who left lands watered by the Seine and the Danube, and sought rest in the crypts of Armagh and Clonmacnoise.

The Church, it has truly been said, is not a disembodied spirit ; it is assimilated to the type of society in which it exists. In the greater part of Europe it adapted itself to feudal ideas, and was organized on the feudal pattern. In Ireland it engrafted itself on the tribal system, which formed the mould of the life of the Irish community. It seems to have had one bishop at least for each tribe, and an extraordinary number of priests ; its bishops, there is little reason to doubt, were nominated by the chiefs of the tribes. Its clergy, too, had apparently no right to tithe, and they never claimed to be superior to secular law, as in the case of the clergy of most of the feudal monarchies. It was, therefore, very different from the supreme Church of Rome, the ecclesiastical centre of the Christian world ; and in the observance of Easter and the garb of its priesthood it had its own special and distinct usages. It was generally regarded with disfavour by the Roman Pontiffs, and was condemned by a series of strict Churchmen—St. Bernard of Clairvaux was the most conspicuous of these—as an unorthodox and even schismatic communion, a sheep that had strayed away from the one fold of the true Shepherd. The Church doubtless suffered much from the tribal discords which prevailed

throughout Ireland from the earliest times, and from the destructive wars with the Danes, and it seems to have declined from its high estate for at least two centuries before the Anglo-Norman conquest. In one respect, too, it had comparatively failed in its work: it appears to have made very little impression on the sexual licentiousness which has always been a characteristic of the untamed Celtic races. It had, nevertheless, many monasteries, schools, and places of learning; and too much credence is not to be given to writers like Giraldus and others, who have persistently defamed it for their own purposes.

The influence of Norman England and of the Anglo-Norman Church was felt by Ireland and her Church in the twelfth century. The see of Dublin was brought under that of Canterbury; Malachy made efforts to unite the Irish Church with Rome; a synod was held at Kells, in Meath, for the same purpose. At last, Nicholas Breakspeare, carrying out the policy of Hildebrand in the case of the Saxon Church of England, empowered Henry of Anjou to subdue Ireland, and to make the Irish Church conform to the Roman model. At a synod convened at Cashel, that Church was declared to be under the discipline and control of Rome; in theory, at least, it was connected with the feudal Church of England. But the decrees of the synod were not obeyed beyond the narrow limits of the English Pale; the Celtic Irish Church remained outwardly little changed for centuries in the greatest part of the island. Two Churches, therefore, were seen in Ireland side by side—that of the Pale, Roman in all respects, and identified with the Church of the Anglo-Norman conquerors, and that of the Irish Celts, still largely distinct from Rome, and claiming the allegiance of a race still not half conquered. Both communions were subject to the Roman pontiffs, but this was almost the only link between them; they exhibited the animosities of two hostile races, and were almost always at feud with each other. In Ireland the seamless garment was already rent. Bishops and abbots of the Church of the Pale sent their retainers in 'hostings' against the 'Irish enemy'; priests of the Irishry were not admitted into their religious houses. The native Irish Church, on the other hand, was a

rallying-point against the invading Englishry ; and there is much proof that in the dreary centuries which witnessed the slow march of English conquest, its salt had lost much of its old savour, and that it became like the uncivilized people in its midst. The annals of both Churches are rather dark with crimes and abuses laid to the charge of their clergy ; and many complaints were made that the clergy of the Church of the Pale were the mere refuse of the clergy of the Church of England. The distinctive feature, however, of both Churches was that they were sunk in the intellectual torpor and ignorance which generally prevailed in Ireland. Unlike what was the case in England, no great Irish Churchmen made their influence felt ; there was nothing like a Lollard movement in Ireland ; an attempt to found a university in Dublin failed. The land, nevertheless, was covered with monasteries and abbeys, of which the ruins still show much architectural beauty ; and the inmates of these probably did good work in preserving the scanty remains of civilized life around them. These foundations, however, starved the secular clergy, and if malevolent reports are to be believed, were seats of superstition and of too frequent vice.

Through the Reformation effected by Henry VIII. the king was declared Head of the Church in England ; the secular power of Rome was effaced in his English dominions ; the monasteries and other religious houses were suppressed. According to the theory of government then prevalent—and it continued in force for long centuries—Ireland was bound to follow the example set by England, and Reformation was imposed on her from without. A Parliament assembled in Dublin in 1536—it was the first that had representatives of the native races—confirmed for Ireland all that had been done in England ; and, as in England, the Irish religious houses became the spoil of nobles and chiefs. Henry, too, was given the title of King, in the stead of Lord of Ireland, in order more fully to express his supreme power ; his Irish policy, in other respects, was statesmanlike ; but we cannot dwell on it, and it was not to be permanent. The change towards Protestantism made in the Church of England by Somerset was carried out in Ireland, so far as this could be

declared by mere power ; the Prayer Book of Edward VI. was introduced into the Church of the Pale, and the emblems of the old faith were largely destroyed within its narrow limits. This reform, however, did not affect the ancient Celtic Church ; within the lands of the Irishry it was a mere dead letter, and the lands of the Irishry were five-sixths of the island. When Mary Tudor ascended the throne, Catholicism was restored in Ireland as in the case of England ; but the landowners kept their hold on the religious houses and their lands, and probably all that was done in this respect by the queen was not felt beyond the region of the Pale. It is remarkable that all these revolutions of faith which convulsed England and went deep into her social life had no corresponding results in Ireland ; there were no Pilgrimages of Grace, no Protestant martyrs, no peasant risings in the land which ere long was to be a theatre for centuries of frightful religious strife.

At the accession of Elizabeth the religious pendulum swung back in Ireland, as it swung back in England. A distinct advance towards Protestantism was made ; Catholicism was proscribed as the faith of the people—Catholicism, at least, in the Roman sense. The queen, unlike her father, did not assume the title of the Head of the Church, but her ecclesiastical supremacy was proclaimed by statute ; those who questioned it were made subject to penalties. At the same time the Prayer Book of Edward VI. was again introduced in a slightly altered form ; the Anglican services were to be read in the churches, the emblems of the Church of Rome were again destroyed. In theory this Reformation was supposed to extend over the whole of Ireland, but in fact it was long confined to the Church of the Pale. As before, the Celtic Church was not touched for years, and even in the Church of the Pale Protestantism made but slow progress. But the reign of Elizabeth witnessed a great change in the condition and the relations of the two Churches. The era of conquest, with confiscation following in its train, had begun in the time of Mary Tudor ; the King's and the Queen's counties had been formed out of the domains of the tribes of O'Moore and O'Connor. This policy was continued by her

successor ; the vast territories of Shane O'Neill and of the Earl of Desmond were wrested from their possessors, and peopled by English and Scottish colonists ; the greater part of Ireland was made shire land. Meanwhile England and Spain had become champions of the Reformation and of the faith of Rome ; Christendom was involved in a fierce and prolonged conflict, and Ireland was made one of its too many theatres. The Englishry of the Pale, for the most part at least, and the swarms of settlers poured in by degrees into the tracts of land that had been subdued and annexed, were Protestants as a rule, and fought for England ; the Irishry, defending their ancient possessions, enthusiastically adhered to their faith and their priesthood, and waged a holy war for the cause of the Pope, backed as it was by the arms of Philip II. It is unnecessary to dwell on the scenes of this horrible strife : it was marked by barbarous atrocities, continued for years ; it was a ruthless struggle of race and religion, in which, as everyone knows, the Irishry went down. In the course of the contest the Church of the Pale, associated with the march of confiscation and conquest, by degrees spread over nearly the whole island ; it had become essentially Protestant in creed ; it was directly opposed to the sentiments and the traditions of the mass of the people. The ancient Celtic Church, on the other hand, at one time all but alien from Rome, had become identified with Rome and the Roman policy, its priesthood was now intensely Roman, and as it had always resisted the advance of the Englishry, so it was now, especially as the chiefs of the tribes had fallen, the main support and hope of the vanquished Celtic Irish race.

Elizabeth, as was significantly said, 'ruled in Ireland over ashes and blood.' At her death James I. found the Irishry in a state of despair and exhaustion. The policy of generations of English statesmen had hitherto been to keep the two races apart ; it now sought to assimilate them by force or other means, and to bring Ireland completely under English law and usage. The whole island was made shire land by a stroke of the pen ; the old Celtic land system was broken up ; innumerable tribal rights were blotted out ; English institutions and laws were extended everywhere. The fierce resentment

of the conquered race may be easily conceived ; at the same time, in the expressive language of Burke, 'the ravage of war went on amidst seeming peace' ; the work of confiscation proceeded without pity or scruple. Six counties in Ulster were placed at the disposition of the Crown by the attainder of the great Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell ; enormous possessions were torn from their ancient owners, in many instances on the most flimsy pretexts. These districts were all brought under English tenure ; except in a part of Ulster the privileges of the children of the soil were effaced—a spoliation that provoked a general feeling of the most intense wrong. The Church of the Pale had now become the Established Church of Ireland ; by this time it had been placed in the stead, as far as law could affect the change, of the ancient Celtic Church, supposed no longer to exist. It engrossed the whole ecclesiastical wealth of the country ; its bishops and clergy had thrust out the old Irish priesthood ; it exacted tithe from the conquered race, a charge perhaps never imposed before. It was a Protestant institution, too, we have said, regarded by the conquering Protestant colonists as a symbol of their faith and an outwork of their power, and regarded by the Irishry as an instrument of heresy and wrong ; it was a material and moral affront to the people in its midst. And, as might have been expected, its nature and characteristics were such as would not lessen the animosity it inspired. It was an Erastian dependency of the rule of the Castle ; its prelates were often harsh tyrants, or merely self-seeking and worldly men ; its clergy were, to a great extent, worthless ; from the nature of the case it could not grow or flourish. The proscribed and injured priesthood of the native Irish Church, thenceforward to be known as Roman Catholic, on the contrary lived in the hearts of their people, and still secretly clung to their ruined altars ; they became more than ever earnest emissaries of Rome, champions of their despoiled and oppressed flocks, deadly foes of England and all of the English and Scottish name in Ireland. The great Irish rising of 1641, caused mainly by the confiscations of late years, but a phase, too, in the religious struggle of the seventeenth century, was, in a great measure, planned by Roman

Catholic priests, and had the enthusiastic support of the whole order.

As the sphere of Protestantism was enlarged in Ireland, and the Established Church spread over the country, the penal laws of Elizabeth were enforced more strictly than they had been before. 'Popish recusants,' as they were called, who denied the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, were punished in an increasing number of instances. This persecution on the ground of religion, though a mere trifle to what it became afterwards, was nevertheless vexatious and provoked much complaint; it was denounced by the Roman Catholic party in the Irish Parliament. The property, too, of the Established Church had been greatly wasted in the course of the preceding century, especially by the encroachments of powerful laymen; and it had never adopted the Articles of the Church of England, or wholly conformed to its services. Wentworth, the celebrated Strafford, was sent by Charles I. to Ireland, to remedy these abuses in the Established Church; he compelled many a greedy 'impropriator' to disgorge his spoils, and, with the assistance of Bramhall, a colleague of Laud, but apparently a much abler man, he made the Church, outwardly in all respects, Anglican, especially in the matter of the Thirty-nine Articles. Nothing was done to change the position of the Roman Catholic Church. Meanwhile, another religious communion had been introduced into Ireland, and was making its influence distinctly felt. The Scottish colonists, who had peopled a part of Ulster, had brought with them the faith of John Knox; Presbyterianism, with its Calvinistic doctrines, its ecclesiastical polity, and its modes of thought, had deeply struck root in the northern province. The Presbyterian ministers appear to have been in friendly relations with the Established Church for years; they were encouraged by Ussher, and perhaps by Bedell, its most distinguished prelates in that age, both really learned and eminent men, and many of its benefices were possessed by them. All this was brought to an end by Strafford and Bramhall; a teasing persecution of the Presbyterians was set on foot; they were generally ejected from the livings which had become their

homes. Three Churches thus existed in Ireland before the middle of the seventeenth century—the Established, the Roman Catholic, and the Presbyterian. They differed from each other in almost all respects, and for many reasons were foes not friends, and Protestantism in Ireland was widely divided by the distinctions between the Established and the Presbyterian Churches.

Roman Catholic Ireland—the Celtic Irishry at least—rose in arms in October 1641. The movement was soon followed by a rising of the Roman Catholics of the Pale, for the most part composed of the old Englishry, the descendants of the Anglo-Norman conquerors. Modern research has shown that the tale of a huge massacre of the Protestant settlers is a myth; but barbarous deeds of blood were done, retaliated by a no less barbarous vengeance. The movements were, to a considerable extent, distinct: the Celts fought for the recovery of the lands they had lost; the men of the Pale for religious liberty; they continued distinct to the last moment, but occasionally they ran into each other; Owen Roe O'Neill and Preston were more than once allies. It does not appear that the clergy of the Established Church were objects of special hatred or even dislike: Bedell, indeed, was mourned by the Roman Catholic leaders, but numbers were driven from the benefices they held. The Church bowed beneath the shock of the tempest; its organization almost went to wreck. It was not favoured by Cromwell when he subdued Ireland; a number of its sees were left vacant; its clergy were treated with contempt and distrust; and though the immense confiscations made by Cromwell brought thousands of English colonists into the land, these were nearly all Puritans and zealots of the Puritan faith. Not the least distinctive feature of this time of civil war and trouble was the decisive influence of the Roman Catholic Church over the whole body of the Irish of its communion. Roman Catholic Ireland has never been so nearly united as when 'the Catholic Confederation' was formed. Rinuccini directed, at least for a time, the councils of the Roman Catholics of both races; the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood resisted Cromwell to the last—even

proposed to hand Ireland over to the Duke of Lorraine. Cromwell marked down the Church and its ministers for special vengeance ; no mercy was shown to friars and priests at the massacres of which Drogheda and Wexford were the scenes ; the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland was sternly proscribed when the Protector sheathed his victorious sword. Its ceremonies and worship were banned as idolatrous ; their celebration was not permitted by law ; hundreds of priests were slain, banished, or forced to leave the country. As for the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, it organized itself when Presbyterianism began to prevail in England ; its synods and polity were established ; many of its ministers intruded on the rights of the Established Church, and took possession of large parts of its property. It was not, however, held in esteem by Cromwell ; he tolerated it, but did little more : he had not forgotten his struggle with Presbyterian Scotland.

The Established Church in Ireland was set up again when Charles II. was restored to the throne. Not less than twelve bishoprics were at once filled up. Bramhall became head of the Church, as Archbishop of Armagh ; the clergy were replaced in the benefices from which they had been expelled. The Church, for a series of years, was hostile to Geneva rather than to Rome ; it resented the intrusions of the Presbyterian clergy ; it preached the High Church doctrines of the Church of England, especially the dogma of Passive Obedience. It had, at this time, some eminent divines—Jeremy Taylor is the most conspicuous instance—but its clergy and laity became widely divided. The great confiscations of Cromwell had, in the main, failed, but they had created 3,000 or 4,000 new owners of the soil ; these settlers, strongly Puritan in creed, disliked the pretensions of the Established Church, and especially its High Church tendencies. A schism was thus effected, which continued for many years, indeed, until nearly the close of the eighteenth century, as the writings of Swift have made evident. The Roman Catholic Church of Ireland remained, in theory, as it had been—that is, a persecuted and proscribed communion ; but it was tolerated under the wise rule of Ormond ; its priesthood, practically restored to their flocks, had not

forgotten the past, but were for years quiescent. The furious religious passions aroused in England by the Exclusion Bill and the villanies of Oates were not felt to any great extent in Ireland; but one eminent personage was made a victim to the frenzy of the hour. Oliver Plunkett, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, was arrested on a false charge and hanged at Tyburn. The Presbyterian Church had to undergo a great deal; it was subject to a real persecution in the shape of a Uniformity Act akin to that in England; its ministers were driven from the benefices they had occupied. A small gift, however, called the Regium Donum, was bestowed on the Presbyterian Church by Charles II.

James II. endeavoured, in his short-lived reign, to restore to some extent his own Church in England. He aimed at making it supreme in Ireland, and he employed an Irish army to attack English liberty, the policy which cost his unhappy father his head. Tyrconnell simply turned things upside down in Ireland. He effected a revolution through which the settlers of English and Scottish blood were placed under the heel of the Roman Catholic Irish of both races. Catholic tyranny suddenly came in the stead of Protestant. The Revolution of 1688 followed. William III. and Mary became King and Queen of England. The Protestant and Presbyterian Irish colonists made an heroic stand in Ulster, the Irish Roman Catholics rushed to arms to a man. The struggle was extended and made more intense by the war which broke out between England and France. William became the representative of the Protestant cause, as Elizabeth had been a century before. Louis XIV., in some measure at least, was the representative, like Philip II., of the cause of the Catholics. It is unnecessary to dwell on the scenes of the contest—the sieges of Limerick and Londonderry, the battles of the Boyne and of Aghrim are celebrated passages in Irish history; Roman Catholic Ireland was subjugated again, as she had been by Cromwell. During the brief supremacy of Roman Catholic Ireland the Established Church yielded to the tempest as it had yielded before; but it seems to have been but little affected by it. It was otherwise with the Roman Catholic Church; it did not acquire the power it acquired in

1641-48 ; no Rinuccini, no Catholic Confederation appeared. But its priesthood passionately seconded the immense rising of the Roman Catholic Irish in 1689-91 ; they put themselves at the head of a most striking movement ; they were conspicuous for their devotion at Aghrim and Limerick. In the hour of peril the Protestant and Presbyterian colonists united against the common enemy ; the clergy of both Churches followed a noble example ; the Presbyterians of Londonderry especially won deserved renown. But when the victory had been won they were scurvily treated ; and the division between the two Churches quickly reappeared.

The sword had now finally subdued Ireland ; the period of confiscation and conquest carried out piecemeal—an agony prolonged for a century and a half—was about to close. It is useless to inquire on which side the balance of national wrong inclines ; but if English statecraft and greed deserve severe censure, Ireland earned the hate of England at the gravest national crises, and passionately assisted her foreign enemies. The indignation felt by the great body of the Protestant Irish colonists, and by the people of England in a lesser degree, accounts for, though it cannot justify, the iniquities that before long followed. The Treaty made at Limerick was shamefully broken ; thousands of acres were wrested from Roman Catholic owners which that compact undoubtedly secured. Large tracts of Roman Catholic land were, besides, forfeited. William was unable or unwilling to repress the fury of the Protestant Colonial Parliament that had its seat in Dublin. These wrongs, however, sink into insignificance compared with the inhuman laws soon imposed on prostrate and vanquished Roman Catholic Ireland. This is not the place to describe what has been rightly called, with emphasis, the Penal Code of Ireland ; it was certainly largely borrowed from edicts against the Huguenots of France ; but the Huguenots were a sect, the Roman Catholic Irish a people. The object of this legislation was to annihilate the few remaining possessors of Roman Catholic lands ; to make the Roman Catholic peasantry a race of helots ; to keep down the Irish Roman Catholic in every walk of life ; and to degrade if not to destroy the Roman Catholic Church of

Ireland. Its priesthood were not proscribed as in the day of Cromwell, but they were compelled to submit to odious restrictions; their hierarchy and religious orders were not to appear in Ireland; their religion was stigmatized in every conceivable way.

The first half of the eighteenth century is the darkest period in the dark annals of Ireland. Protestant ascendancy, as it was significantly called—ever growing since the days of Elizabeth—and Roman Catholic subjection had become complete. The Government of Ireland and nearly all the land, with the authority which its possession gives, were monopolised by settlers of English and Scottish blood, alien in race and faith from the old Englishry and the native people; these formed a distinct, domineering caste, divided from their inferiors by many evil memories. This settlement of confiscation and conquest was propped up by the inhuman Penal Code which consecrated wrong in the name of law, perpetuated the bad divisions in the frame of society, and checked the influences which might have softened them away; it had nothing resembling it in any part of Europe. But though the colonial oligarchy—its characteristics had remained unchanged, though it had been planted for generations in the land—had a free hand to do nearly what it pleased in Ireland, and especially to lord it over the subjugated race, it was maltreated by the mother country; its Parliament was degraded, its trade contracted; it had a licence to tyrannize, but it did not prosper. As for the Roman Catholic Irish, they were kept down in a state of abasement which appeared hopeless. Their bolder spirits took their swords into foreign armies, and became relentless enemies of the British name; their followers—pathetically called the ‘wild geese’—fled to France and formed the celebrated brigade which, at Fontenoy, turned the scales of fortune. But the mass of the Roman Catholics vegetated on the land of which their fathers had been despoiled, the few of the aristocracy looked upon as mere pariahs, the rest of the community as ‘Papist slaves.’ It is easy to understand what the characteristics were of the Established Church of Ireland in this position of affairs. It produced, indeed, some eminent

divines : King, Browne, and Synge were learned and able men ; Berkeley was a light shining amidst surrounding darkness. But the Church, more than ever had been the case before, became identified with the Protestant ascendancy in its midst ; it was completely associated with the rule of the Castle ; it was more than ever a symbol of alien conquest. Two of its prelates were virtually the rulers of Ireland for a series of years ; many of its bishops were mere instruments of what was known as 'the English interest.' As the result, what Berkeley perceived and mourned, the Church stood completely apart from the Roman Catholic Irish ; it was for them a badge of the odious power of the conqueror ; it was a sterile branch of a tree that bore little wholesome fruit. And, as might have been expected, it was full of the evils of Erastian dependence. Swift has described its dignitaries in characteristic language : the great body of its clergy were sons of county families, or, in many instances, the offscourings of the Church of England. It did little good work, and it could not flourish ; cathedrals in ruins and empty churches were visible signs of its unprosperous state. Swift believed that ere long it was destined to fall. It should be added that until the reign of George II. it retained a good deal of its High Church sympathies, being bitterly hostile to the Presbyterian Church ; and it was not revered by the Protestant lords of the soil, who plundered it in the Irish Parliament.

The condition of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland during this dismal period was altogether different. Its priesthood were the despised and rejected of men ; they were sometimes persecuted by the cruel laws in force ; it was kept in subjection and even thralldom. But its organization was never broken up ; its hierarchy continued to exist in secret ; its ministers did their offices and teaching to devoted flocks ; its spiritual life became more potent. By degrees it emerged in some degree from this state of subjection ; it was treated with a toleration akin to contempt ; Swift regarded it as powerless, and almost beneath notice. But it had put off the pretensions of the preceding century ; it retained much of the spirit of its divine Founder ; its influence over its people was immense in this night of

affliction. Its most remarkable achievement at this time was that it greatly improved the morality of the Irish peasantry; they were rescued from the sexual licence to which they had been prone; their domestic virtues have been long a proverb. As for the Presbyterian Church, it was, strange to say, discountenanced and kept under in this period. The Presbyterians were subjected to a severe test, which excluded them from the Irish Parliament and from offices in the State; they were regarded with extreme dislike by the men in power in Ireland, and notably by the clergy of the Established Church, as the writings of Swift abundantly prove. The results were unfortunate in many respects, and continued for a very considerable time. The schism in Irish Protestantism became complete; it has lasted down to the present day. The upper classes of the Presbyterians largely conformed to the Established Church; a division was thus created between the landed gentry and the occupiers of the soil in Ulster, which, to this hour, has had pernicious effects. And the Presbyterian ministers had their sympathies narrowed and became bitterly hostile to the Established Church, and to the existing order of things around them.

In the second half of the eighteenth century a change gradually passed over the order of things in Ireland. Protestant ascendancy was mitigated in some respects; Roman Catholic subjection became less manifest. The descendants of the English and Scottish settlers slowly turned to Ireland as to their adopted country; they formed an 'Irish interest' in the Parliament that met in Dublin. The Penal Code, too, was evaded and relaxed; the human conscience, stirred by the experiences of the beginning of the century, revolted against a scheme of the worst kind of oppression. The relations between the Protestant and the old Roman Catholic owners of the land became less hostile, and were often friendly; the two classes even began to unite in marriage. At the same time the condition of the Roman Catholics was improved; a Roman Catholic body of traders grew up, and a number of large Roman Catholic farmers; the state of the peasantry was made somewhat better. This favourable change was to some extent quickened by the almost national movement of 1782,

which brought Protestant and Roman Catholic Ireland together in a common cause ; it was promoted by important reforms effected in the Irish Parliament. This progress, nevertheless, was probably less than it has been described ; the lines of demarcation between the Irish Protestants and the Irish Roman Catholics were too deeply drawn to be easily effaced ; they remain clearly marked, perhaps indelible, to this day. The Established Church during this period continued to be very much as it had been, but signs of improvement were not wanting. Its Erastian character remained impressed on it ; its highest dignitaries were nominated by the Castle and in its interest. But the movement of which Wesley and Whitfield were the master spirits unquestionably stirred the great body of its clergy ; these became as a rule more zealous of good works ; some of its bishops were very distinguished men. An impassable barrier nevertheless divided it from the mass of the people ; it was a voice in a wilderness crying to the Irish Roman Catholics ; it could not free itself from the associations of the past. For the rest, its material condition was not changed ; its organization and government were not good ; there was, too, a painful and marked contrast between the often extravagant wealth of its prelates and the poverty of the great majority of the inferior clergy.

The Roman Catholic Church of Ireland during this period became recognised, nay favoured, by the State. Its clergy had no longer to hide their heads ; its services, indeed were performed in mean and wretched 'chapels' ; but its hierarchy established itself in Ireland, and was even occasionally consulted by British statesmen. The Roman Catholic Irish priesthood of that age was often educated at Douay, St. Omer, and Louvain, and, as a rule, was a timid and pious order of men ; when the Revolution broke out in France its sympathies were distinctly against it ; even in Ireland it gave proof of Conservative tendencies. But it had not by any means forgotten the past ; priests were leaders among the rebels of 1798 ; the institution of Maynooth for the education of the Irish priesthood undoubtedly quickened its patriotic sentiments. In this period the influence of the Irish

Roman Catholic Church over its communion generally remained unchanged ; it ruled over a devout, but a superstitious people. During these years the discontent of Presbyterian Ireland and even its disaffection to the State, of which it had great cause to complain, were exhibited in many ominous symptoms. Its grievances were partly reduced by degrees, but there were Presbyterian risings in Ulster against rent and tithe, akin to the Whiteboy movements in the provinces of the South ; thousands of Presbyterians fled from Ireland at the crisis of the American War and became soldiers in Washington's army ; the French Revolution stirred Presbyterian Ireland to its depths ; Presbyterians were the first United Irishmen. The Presbyterian ministry were more or less identified with the conduct of their flocks, but none took part in open rebellion.

The maintenance of the Established Church of Ireland was made a fundamental part of the Treaty of Union ; it was united, indeed, with the Church of England. During the thirty years of Tory rule in the three kingdoms, from 1800 to 1830, its organization remained unchanged ; its hierarchy and clergy had the status they held in the eighteenth century. But Catholic Emancipation was wrung by O'Connell from a reluctant Parliament after the famous Clare election of 1828, and in the great democratic movement following the Reform Act of 1832 the Irish Established Church was almost inevitably assailed. The most decisive attack was that made against its tithes, which had always been a detested impost, and which Pitt and Grattan had endeavoured to commute. A frightful agrarian war broke out ; it ended practically in the triumph of the peasantry who had defied the law. After some years of trouble the tithe was at last converted into a land tax charged on the owner of the soil, and not, as had been the case, on its occupant ; this relieved the mass of the tithepayers from an odious burden, and laid it on the landed gentry, for the most part Protestants. The Episcopate of the Church, too, was reduced to twelve sees and important internal reforms were made ; these changes placed the Establishment on a much sounder basis ; it remained intact, nay unchallenged, for a series of years ; Parliament and its leaders did

not interfere with it. During the period from 1800 to 1869 the Church made great progress in spiritual life; it threw off the evil moral slough of the eighteenth century; it produced a noble succession of eminent divines—Magee, Brinkley, O'Brien, Archer Butler, Fitzgerald, are well known names, and scores of others could be added to the list—and its clergy, as a body, were excellent men, in hundreds of instances loved by the Roman Catholic peasantry. In Dublin and many of the larger towns, it had real vitality and moral influence; large congregations were devotedly attached to it. Nevertheless the evils of its origin clung to it; it was still a dependency of the Erastian Castle; its communion did not embrace more than an eighth part of the whole people; it was still in the eyes of the Irish Roman Catholics, and notably of the Roman Catholic priesthood, a trophy of conquest and confiscation never forgotten. It had, too, associated itself with the Evangelical cause in England, and had a tendency to strong Evangelical teaching; and some of its clergy had worked hard to proselytise in Roman Catholic flocks, a subject of the resentment and jealousy of their priesthood. It was identified, moreover, with the settlement of the Irish land made in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, and with the Protestant ascendancy then established; and though that ascendancy had been broken down, and the Penal Code had long been a thing of the past, the memory of it was still a living tradition. The existence, indeed, of that sentiment is but too apparent at the present hour; a crusade is being carried on against the Irish landed gentry, mainly because they are the heirs of spoliation in the past; they are made to suffer, however innocent they may be, and however powerless they are now, for the sins of their fathers, and for the position these had been given in the State. The Penal Code, indeed, has been fully avenged.

The hierarchy of the Irish Roman Catholic Church played a conspicuous part at the time of the Union. They were often consulted by the Government; promises were made to them that, if they would support the Union, Catholic Emancipation would before long follow, and that a provision would be made by the State for their clergy, a policy which certainly

Pitt had at heart. These promises, however, were unhappily broken, partly owing to the obstinacy of George III., partly to the questionable conduct of Pitt himself; an immense opportunity to conciliate Ireland was lost. A revolution passed over the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland in the generation that grew up after the Union. Its clergy ceased to be a timid and Conservative body of men, as they had been in the later years of the eighteenth century; the influence of their seminary of Maynooth on the spot told; they acquired strong feelings and sympathies 'racy of the soil'; they became once more like the priesthood of the seventeenth century. O'Connell perceived what an element of power they were; he banded them into a most formidable organization in 1824-28, to which Catholic Emancipation was largely due; they gave their devoted assistance in the Repeal movement of 1843-44. Before this time the famous Irish tribune had persuaded the Irish Roman Catholic bishops to reject the policy known by the name of the 'Veto,' and to deny the Crown a voice in the appointments to their sees; the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood gradually became too much akin to sacerdotal demagogues. They produced, nevertheless, not a few eminent men—Doyle, Murray, Croly, MacHale, and others are distinguished names; and they retained, if indeed they did not increase, their authority over their submissive flocks. Meanwhile the material condition of the Church was wonderfully improved; the miserable 'chapels' of another age for the most part disappeared; fine cathedrals and good parish churches were built; religious houses spread over many parts of the country. Cardinal Cullen, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh and then of Dublin, a strong Ultramontane of the reaction that followed 1848, endeavoured for some years to check and to put down the political tendencies of the priesthood; he prohibited 'agitation' on political questions; but these tendencies revived when he passed away. The Church resumed again an aggressive attitude to much that existed in the order of things in Ireland, though it took the side of the State in the abortive rising of 1848, and it sternly condemned the Fenian movement. A considerable change took place in the

Presbyterian Church during the two generations that followed the Union. The Irish Presbyterians, to a great extent disloyal before, became gradually attached to the State and to the connexion of Ireland with Great Britain, as their grievances were removed by degrees ; the great success of their commerce with England strengthened this feeling. Their ministers, too, were won over by a large augmentation of the *Regium Donum*. It deserves special notice that they were, for the most part, weaned from the Arian and Unitarian sympathies to which they had been prone in the eighteenth century, and that they all but universally returned to the fold of Knox. But the Presbyterian Church remained completely divided from the Establishment, and the Presbyterians, as an order of men, did not coalesce with the aristocracy of the soil of another communion.

Owing to the terror inspired by the Fenian rising of 1865-67, the end of the Establishment in Ireland came in 1869-70. This is not the place to describe the famous measure by which the Church was disestablished and disendowed. Enough to say that its connexion with the State ceased ; that its revenues were vested in a commission ; that ample funds were reserved for existing interests ; that it retained its cathedrals and places of worship ; that the grants to Maynooth and the *Regium Donum* were extinguished and compensated for out of the property of the Church ; and that its 'surplus funds' have been applied to purposes of a charitable kind. Two features of this policy deserve attention : no provision was made for the priesthood of the Irish Roman Catholic Church—in our judgment, a very grave error—and encouragement was given to increase the funds of the Church in the future by a scheme of 'commutation,' equitable and skilful alike. It is rather our object to glance at the state of the Church since it has been disestablished and disendowed. It was given complete freedom of synodal action ; it has its general and its diocesan synods ; there can be no doubt that the revolution through which it has passed has, on the whole, been a blessing to it. It has not indeed shown any signs of expansion, and it was impossible to expect this : but it is no longer an appanage of the Erastian Castle ; it is more full of

spiritual life than it ever was ; it fulfils the ideal of a Church much better than it ever did ; it is more closely united to heaven. It is now not absolutely identified with the Church of England ; its canons and services show a slight difference. For example, the Athanasian Creed is not a necessary part of its service. It exhibits on the whole rather Low Church tendencies, but its bishops and clergy are a body of excellent men, some learned, nearly all with moderate views, and its laity have given it most generous support, impoverished as they have been by the troubles of the last twenty years. As for the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, it remains much as it was in the last generation ; but its priesthood have lent themselves too much to agitation of a revolutionary and socialistic kind, which has been unequivocally condemned at Rome ; it would have been very different had they been honourably endowed by the State. And though the Church externally has a majestic aspect, and commands the allegiance of the great body of its flocks, it has hardly the moral authority it had. A small but active party has grown up within it which dislikes and even defies its pretensions. The Presbyterian Church of Ireland has changed but little in the last thirty years ; it is still completely divided from the disestablished Church ; the prospect of a closer union seems to be hopeless. Its ministers, too, have lately given too much support to the agrarian agitation which is now threatening to involve the Irish landed gentry in ruin.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH AND THE CLERGY
AFTER THE RESTORATION, 1660-1714.

1. Burnet's *History of his Own Time*. (Various editions.)
2. Supplement to Burnet. Edited by H. C. FOXCROFT. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.)
3. Aubrey's *Brief Lives*. Edited by ANDREW CLARK. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.)
4. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*. (London: various dates.)
5. C. Babington's *Criticism of Macaulay's Character of the Clergy*. (London, 1849.)
6. *Life in the English Church, 1660-1714*. By J. H. OVERTON. (London: Longmans, 1885.)
7. *The Life of Dean Granville*. By ROGER GRANVILLE. (Exeter: W. Pollard, 1902.)
8. The Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian Library.

THERE is no such great dividing-line in the fifty years that followed the Restoration as in the half-century that preceded it. It was 'the Wars' that changed England. When they were over, and Church and king had their own again, the clergy soon settled down to their duties, and the external business of the Church went on, with no striking changes or important reforms, till a new era began with the Hanoverian line.

It will be the object of this article to collect scattered instances, from the documents and histories of the time, of the social position of the Church and the clergy, and of the nature of Church customs and usages and the outward expression of spiritual and devotional life.

The Restoration period was notoriously an age of great men in the Church. Baxter and Bunyan without, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, South, Barrow, Stillingfleet, Bull, Burnet and Henry Wharton, are names that stand for divers and splendid qualities; and they are a small selection indeed from the notable men who have left memorials of their piety and scholarship. The transference to the reigns of the later Stewarts of the eulogy passed on the English clergy in the

reign of Charles I. might well be justified : ' Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi.'

But it may be that the work of these great men is to be regarded as altogether exceptional. This at least may be argued. In *Ichabod, or the Five Groans of the Church*, 1663, the writer (probably Ken) observed that the children of the Church were discontented, the government complained of, the ordinances neglected, the ministers despised, the peace disturbed, the safety endangered. After a vindication of the discipline and orders of the Church, and a distinct assertion of the Apostolical Succession as the foundation, he speaks of the number of young ministers now ordained, often unsettled, rash and inexperienced, some even men expelled from college, many unlearned. Four hundred and twenty-six tradesmen who, 'having intruded in former years into the sacred calling of a minister, are now ordained into it,' are but part of those who accepted ordination at the Restoration settlement, of whom the whole number is 1,342; and their adhesion is due, not to the conscience of the Church's principles, but to the prosperity of her cause. And the morals of such men, too, cause scandal, and the simony, the pluralities, the non-residence, and the curates whom the non-resident clergy employ: 'I do not know by what law of God or man a clergyman may turn his tithe to private advantage any more than a layman.' He calculates that out of 12,000 Church livings, about 3,000 are impropriated, and 4,165 are sinecures or 'non-residents' livings. It is clear that the measures of the Parliamentary Committee under the Commonwealth had been ineffectual, and the need for the purchase of the impropriations, which Laud and Charles I. had at heart, still remained—and was to remain—pressing.

The poverty of the clergy was notorious. The subject of clerical incomes naturally aroused attention after the disasters of the War. The *Dolben Papers* contain a list of the clergy of England and their incomes. In 1680 was published a *Book of the Valuations of all the Ecclesiastical Preferments in England and Wales*, estimating their liability to tithes. In 1685 a translation of Simon's book on *Ecclesiastical Revenues* was published in London. The evidence that can be

collected shows the life of privation which many of the parish priests must have undergone.

The moral as well as the material effects of the Civil War were felt severely, and not less those of the relaxed morality of the Restoration. In Lee's *Life of Kettlewell* a gloomy account is given of the standard of clerical performance thirty years later. The retirement of the Nonjurors had led to the appointment of inferior men, who had every temptation to slackness. A notable decrease in the daily services followed, and the weekly celebration of the Holy Communion 'was now much unfrequented in comparison of what it had been.' The Cathedral statutes fell into neglect, and preparation for Baptism and the Holy Communion was practically abandoned. Burnet admits that public morals much deteriorated and disbelief in revealed religion spread. 'The nation,' he writes of the period of the Revolution, 'was falling under a general corruption both as to morals and principles'; and Bentley in his *Boyle Lectures* took up the tale against the philosophy of Hobbes as at the root of the evil, declaring that 'of this the taverns and coffee-houses, nay, Westminster Hall and the very churches, were full.' Thus it might seem that the public morals reflected the decline in the influence of the clergy; but it is difficult to assert that this was the case.

Undoubtedly the poverty of the clergy remained to the end of the period a serious distress. Swift declares that a reader in a London church would receive 20*l.* a year, a lecturer in a town 60*l.*, a chaplain 30*l.* and vails or perquisites; while country incumbents would receive from 20*l.* to 60*l.*, and, curates rarely more than 30*l.* With this it might be expected that the clergy were not drawn from a high social class; and, indeed, the literature of the period is full of jests at the poor men who took holy orders and remained in a condition little above that of domestic service. Rising from the condition wittily satirized in a squib of the time, when the young servitor was glad of anything he could pick up—('I am a rising lad, mother, and have gott prefarment in college allready, for our sextoun beeing gonn intoo Heryfordshear has left mee his depoty, which is a very good place,' the letter begins; and it concludes with believing he shall do very

well 'if you wull but send me t'other crowne')—it was not to be wondered at if some attained no higher dignity than that expressed in Oldham's famous lines :

'Diet, an horse, and thirty pounds a year,
 Besides th' advantage of his lordship's ear,
 The credit of the business and the state,
 Are things that in a youngster's sense sound great.
 Little the unexperienced wretch doth know
 What slavery he oft must undergo ;
 Who though in silken scarf and cassock drest
 Wears but a gayer livery at best.
 When dinner calls, the implement must wait,
 With holy words to consecrate the meat,
 But hold it for a favour seldom shown
 If he be deign'd the honour to sit down.'

From descriptions such as this, from a pamphlet called *The Character of a Whig under several Denominations*, 1700, and from Eachard's *Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion*, 1670, a famous picture of the social position of the clerical estate under the later Stewarts has been drawn. But it bears small resemblance to the truth. Eachard complains, from the standing-point of a university don, of the ignorance of some of the clergy and the extreme poverty of others ; and as a cause of the latter alleges the 'infinite number that are in holy orders,' the eagerness and ambition which leads them into the profession, the ease of procuring men for 25*l.* or 30*l.* a year, and the disproportionate revenues of the bishops. Steele, in the *Tatler* (1710), mocks at the exclusion of the clergy from the later courses of the dinner, and asks what a Roman Catholic priest would think of such treatment ? But all this, and the mirth of the playhouses, was admittedly an exaggeration. Never was the class more respected. Socially, in the later seventeenth century the clergy probably stood higher than ever before that period. Feilding, Fane, Finch, Montague, Compton, Grenville, Berkeley, Crewe, and Trelawney, are among the ancient and honourable names which a contemporary noted among the clergy ; and another added, 'as for the gentry, there are not many good families in England but either have or have

had a clergyman in them.' The aspersions on the marriages of the clergy have been disproved by a careful investigation. A sermon of Sprat's in 1678 concludes with a statement which, while eulogizing the married state, appears to show that the material condition of the clergy was improving. 'As more clergymen were impoverished by the calamities of the late war and oppression of the Church and State than ever in the like space before, so I think it may be said without envy that more clergymen or their heirs than ever in one time before, since they were allowed marriage, have been brought to a plentiful and prosperous condition by his Majesty's, and with him the Church's, most happy restoration'; and the same writer, when Bishop of Rochester, speaks of clerical learning and the clergy's libraries in a manner which implies the sufficiency of each. None the less, the smallness of the revenues of the clergy cannot be denied; even dignitaries like Grenville, who kept up the old hospitality, soon found themselves in difficulties; and it is on that, not on want of learning, breeding, or character, that the real weakness of their position must be allowed to rest. There was no great division between town and country clergy—certainly no greater one than between town and country gentry. Popular feeling was very largely directed by the writings of men in Holy Orders, and their intervention in politics, as in the case of the Seven Bishops or that of Sacheverell, was often decisive.

The *Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, a work written by John Johnson of Cranbrook, is full of interesting details as to the position, legal, and to some extent social, of the clergy at the close of the seventeenth century. Its success—for it was very frequently reprinted—shows the importance that attached to questions relating to the clerical estate. On the whole, it may be said that the social standing of the clergy, far from declining, advanced during the period under review; and of their influence there are many remarkable instances. Among them may perhaps be noted the extraordinary interest which was aroused by the sermons of the day. The publication of sermons was found lucrative both by preacher and printer. In spite of length (Barrow once preached for three hours and a half on Charity before the Lord Mayor), of

elaboration (till Tillotson introduced a simpler style), of facetiousness (South's sermons kept his congregation in constant mirth), and of the difficulties of extemporary preaching, which Burnet and others began to encourage, the popularity of sermons increased rather than diminished between the days of Charles I. and those of Anne. The most remarkable example of this taste is the fact that after his death two thousand five hundred guineas were given for the copyright of the two volumes of Tillotson's discourses, which now would not arouse interest in the most impressionable or the most pious of men.

The substitution of unwritten for written sermons appears to have been due to influences external to the English Church—to the examples of Puritans and Papists. A story of Charles II. and Stillingfleet illustrates the change that was taking place. It is said of the latter that

'while chaplain to King Charles, his Majesty asked him "How it came about that he always read his sermons before him, when he was informed he always preached without books elsewhere?" He told the King that "the awe of so noble an audience, where he saw nothing that was not greatly superior to him; but chiefly, the seeing before him so great and wise a prince made him afraid to trust himself. . . ." "But pray," says Stillingfleet, "will your Majesty give me leave to ask you a question too? Why you read your speeches when you can have none of the same reasons?" "Why truly, doctor," says the King, "your question is a very pertinent one, and so will be my answer. I have asked them so often and for so much money, that I am ashamed to look them in the face."'

The change made way very gradually; the number of published sermons so late as 1714 shows that it had not even then conquered. With the progress of the change there began to disappear, though gradually, those extraordinary substitutes for the Catholic requiem, the funeral sermons, from which so much of our knowledge of the religious life of the seventeenth century is derived. No endowments were more common at this period than for a yearly sermon on the *obit* of some often quite undistinguished person; and no person of any eminence for position or piety was suffered to be buried without a eulogy, which was then published as

a memorial of departed greatness or virtue. A notable sermon of one of the most famous preachers of the day, Dr. Anthony Horneck of the Savoy, on Mrs. Dorothy St. John, fourth daughter of Oliver St. John, preached at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in 1677, remarks that the office of the preachers 'is to convert souls, not to paint them'; but it may well have been thought that the record of genuine piety was a valuable instrument of conversion. It was, indeed, fit and proper that the world should learn of the beauty of a young damsel's life of whom it might be said that 'the fruits of the Spirit, which are not seen in others before fifty, appeared in her at eighteen, and the joys of the Holy Ghost, which are not counted *modish* till fourscore, became familiar to her as soon as her reason began to exert itself in action.' No less fit was it that the history of a remarkable conversion like that of the debauched John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, should be told by those in whose hands God had placed his conversion, 'to awaken those who run on to all the excesses of riot.' Sermons, indeed, at funerals, as well as the pertinent epitaphs which preached from every church wall, were in the seventeenth century distinct missionary instruments, which the clergy employed in addition to the ordinary weapons of the spiritual warfare.

It may be noticed in this place that the custom during this period was to wear the black gown in the pulpit, though the use of the surplice had been restored in all the other ministrations of the church. Strype wrote in 1696:

'Yesterday I saw in Low Leighton church that which, to my remembrance, I never did see in a church in England but once, and that is a minister preach in a surplice. For Mr. Harrison, whereas other ministers on Feast days do not so much as wear any surplice, he, by way of supererogation, preached in his. The sight did stir up in me more of pity than anger to see the folly of the man; but if he preach in a fool's coat we will go and hear him.'

The importance of sermons did not diminish the attention paid to the other agencies by which the religious life was fostered. The Sacraments, fasting, books of devotion, Church music, all bore their part, and they were supplemented

by the creation of vigorous Societies for the cultivation of the devout life.

Soon after the Restoration a serious attempt was made by several of the bishops to secure, in parish as well as in cathedral churches, a more frequent celebration of the Holy Communion. The number of communicants had clearly diminished since 1640. Frequency of communion had been discouraged by the action of the Puritans when in power. An 'Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, together with the rules and directions concerning suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' (1645), required assent to statements of doctrine highly disputable, if not explicitly heretical, and examination by elders in a form which the letters of Lady Verney show to have been regarded with disgust and suspicion. The result was natural; sensitive people would not undergo the ordeal; and the custom of frequent communion was never successfully revived. The first and most obvious consequence of this had been the rare administration of the Holy Sacrament. This reformers now set themselves to remedy. The bishops before the War had, it would appear, combined to desire that 'the blessed sacrament of Holy Communion be administered in the church every month upon the first Sunday, or at least thrice in the year, whereof Easter to be one.'¹ Sancroft's injunctions of 1688 inquire whether this rule is carried out. Patrick, when Dean of Peterborough, noted the archbishop's order that there should be a weekly Communion. Dean Grenville, of Durham, devoted himself persistently for many years to securing the observance of this rule. In 1683 he recorded a conversation with Fell, Bishop of Oxford, who agreed with his wish, but advised 'the stirring up of some devout people, ladies or gentlemen, to desire the same from the Dean and Chapter, as the best expedient to effect that good work, saying that the Dean and Prebends could not justify the denial thereof; and besides, it was a very plausible way for them to steal into their duty without exposing themselves for their past omissions and neglects.' He noted at the same

¹ Brian Duppa's *Articles of Enquiry*, Chichester, 1638.

time that Dr. Bury, rector of Exeter College, Oxford, was 'exceedingly positive that it ought to be a constant concomitant of all Feasts as well as the Sunday,' &c., and argued, in writing to Sir William Dugdale, whom he called 'so eminent a champion for our Common Prayer Book,' that 'the rubric (if it be strictly examined) doth at this very day suppose daily' communions. He restored weekly communion at Durham; at Ely, Christ Church, and Worcester, it had always been retained; it was re-introduced at Canterbury, at York, at St. Paul's when it was rebuilt, at Gloucester, and apparently at Rochester. It was part of a general revival of interest in Church observances and rubrics. Thus in the Royal Chapels, when the Court was in London, the Holy Communion was celebrated twice on Sundays, at 8 and 12. The usual hour in the London churches was 7 or 8, but at St. Lawrence Jewry, where the Vicar was a great-nephew of Nicholas Ferrar, the celebration of Holy Communion was at 6. At St. Dunstan's-in-the-West there was a celebration daily during the octaves of Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide. At Easter 1685 Bishop Crewe issued an Injunction to the Dean and Chapter of Durham, and in the October of that year Dr. Grenville wrote to Sancroft, who had formerly been a prebendary of the same cathedral church: 'Among many other excellent things, my Lord of Durham hath strictly enjoined us to continue the weekly Communion with jubilation (fallen into disuse since the death of Bishop Cosin), and to restore sermons on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent and Advent.' The bidding of prayer before sermon and the weekly Communion have continued in Durham Cathedral ever since, and the celebration has been 'with jubilation,' that is, chorally; but, till of late years, this has only been given once a month.

Little, if any, change was made in ceremonial. The altar was hung with rich cloths or carpets, of the gifts of which there are many records. It appears from the usage of Sancroft that altar plate was solemnly consecrated to its sacred use. Copes were worn in many of the cathedral churches. Incense was burnt on solemn occasions ('before the office began,' Evelyn records, on Easter Day, 1684, in Whitehall

Chapel), and censers, judging again by the example of Archbishop Sancroft, appear to have been consecrated; but there seems to be some doubt about the matter, and it is probable that only one of the cathedral churches (Ely) kept up the use of incense during divine service, while in parish churches it was employed from time to time in a hardly recognised confusion between the purposes of fumigation and ceremonial.

Almost universally, the Laudian rule as to the position of the altar was accepted at the Restoration. Still, however, in many places the minister came down to give the Sacrament to the people as they knelt in their pews; and the pious Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick, on one occasion speaks as though the holy table was at times moved:

'When the minister was going to consecrate the bread and wine, the Communion-table being a good way from before my pew, he of a sudden drew it till he brought it just before my pew; as he was doing so God was pleased to put this thought into my mind, which much affected me, that as the minister drew the table nearer, so God the Father drew near now to me with an offer of my dear Saviour to take away all my sins.'

Frampton's Life records as a scandal the case of a parish priest 'whose manner was after consecration to carry the holy elements into the reading-desk, and then return and in a most uncanonical manner distribute them to his parishioners.' Nelson tells of Bull, that 'whenever he officiated at the altar it was exactly agreeable to the rubric, and with the gravity and seriousness of a primitive priest,' and that his custom was to offer the elements 'upon the holy table, in the first place, in conformity to the practice of the ancient Church, before he began the Communion Service; and this the rubric after the offertory seemeth to require of all her priests.' The revision, in 1662, of the rubric at the end of the Communion Service clearly points to consideration of two questions: that of desecration by irreverent clergy—a practice which the writings of Cosin and Thorndike show to have formed a convenient weapon for Roman Catholic controversialists; and that of reservation. With regard to the latter there would seem to be no record; but Thorndike's criticism of the Roman practice of reserving in one kind only

may perhaps be taken to imply that the English Church reserved in both, and he says (writing in 1670, when the rubrics of 1662 may be concluded to have been understood):

‘And thus far I will particularise as concerning the Eucharist; that the Church is to endeavour the celebrating of it so frequently that it may be reserved to the next Communion. For in the meantime it ought to be so ready for them that pass into the other world that they need not stay for the consecrating of it on purpose for every one. The reason of the necessity of it for all, which hath been delivered, aggravates it very much in danger of death. And the practice of the Church attests it to the utmost. Neither will there be any necessity of giving it in one kind only; as by some passages of antiquity may be collected, if common reason could deceive in a subject of this nature.’

When we pass from the Holy Communion to Holy Baptism we find efforts constantly made by members of reforming Societies to revive its public use on occasions when the churches were full of worshippers. Bull was very careful to minister it always ‘on Sundays and holy days, when the greatest number of persons were met together,’ but the registers show generally that while private Baptism in houses was rare, public Baptism in church on Sunday was little more common.

The penitential system of the Church survived the Civil War without serious alteration. The teaching on the subject is clear and continuous. Heylin, in *The Doctrine and Discipline of the English Church*, 1662, states the accepted view when he writes that the priests ‘retained their native and original power in the court of conscience by hearing the confession of a sorrowful and afflicted penitent, and giving him the comfort of absolution, a power conferred upon them in their ordination.’ The *Guide for the Penitent*, attributed to Brian Duppa, contains the advice of particular confession; and Jeremy Taylor repeated it. So Sparrow wrote, ‘he that would be sure of pardon, let him seek out a priest and make his humble confession unto him.’ That this advice was very largely followed the history of the period contains abundance of instances to prove. Morley, Bishop of Winchester, left record of how he acted as ‘spiritual director and guide’ to

Anne Hyde, Duchess of York, stating that before every Communion 'she made a voluntary confession of what she thought she had offended God in, either by omission or commission, professing her sorrow for it, and promising amendment of it, and then, kneeling down, she desired and received absolution in the form and words prescribed by our Church.' Tenison heard Queen Mary's confession. Archbishop Sharpe was the spiritual director of Queen Anne. Evelyn records that Jeremy Taylor was his confessor. Pepys is known to have made his confession to Hickes. Grenville had Bishop Gunning at one time for his confessor, and himself left elaborate rules for the hearing of confessions. Lenthall, the Speaker of the Long Parliament, who died in 1662, made his confession to his old friend and chaplain, Ralph Brideoak, then rector of Witney and afterwards Bishop of Chichester. Seth Ward, Bishop of Salisbury, told Aubrey that 'he did the last office of a confessor to his Grace' of Albemarle. But the instances are too numerous to admit of any doubt as to the frequency of the practice. And the Visitation Articles make constant inquiry as to the 'priest or minister' of each parish observing strictly the secrecy required by the 113th canon of 1604. There are many records of the penances prescribed and enforced. Many parish churches appear to have benefited, in repair or adornment, by sums of money paid in penance for offences thus estimated by bishops.

The daily services were recognized to be the rule of the Church. In London, daily morning and evening prayers were said in most churches, the congregations being to some extent provided by the new Religious Societies.

The Life of Frampton shows him most active as bishop in reviving the daily prayers, and familiarizing with 'the venerable forms of the Church' those who had become 'almost strangers to the devotional way of worship in the Church of England.' Dean Grenville's *Diary* observes many places where daily prayers, as well as monthly celebrations, were held; but it is noted by Nelson in his Life of Bull that when he came to Siddington, Gloucestershire, 'the Holy Eucharist, the mysterious rite and perfection of Christian worship, was not performed so often as he desired; and yet oftener than

is usual in little villages ; for he brought it to seven times in the year.' Grenville recommended all the clergy of his arch-deaconry to observe the rule of George Herbert's Country Parson 'for their direction, in order to the exemplary discharge of their function, having,' he added, 'always made it mine.' His curates frequently resided in his house and pursued their studies under his direction. He was strict in requiring the daily performance of Mattins and Evensong in each of his churches, on working days at six, morning and evening ; but on vigils, eves and Saturdays, Evensong was at three ; and on Wednesday and Friday, and all through Advent and Lent and on the Ember Days, Mattins was at nine, with a short sermon, not more than a quarter of an hour long. On Sunday and holy day afternoons there was always catechizing after the second lesson, and there were sermons on all Sundays and feasts. The Rogation Days were always observed by 'the perambulation.'

The observance of Lent, required by the State as well as the Church, showed some signs of relaxation after the Wars. But it was still kept up in many parts of the country, and by devout Churchfolk. One of the first official acts of Juxon as archbishop of Canterbury was to grant a licence to Secretary Nicholas and his household to eat meat in Lent. The use of the Laudian period was kept up in many parishes, where we find the registers noting exemptions from the rule owing to illness and the order of physicians. As late as 1663 the Corporation of Weymouth ordered the butchers not to 'dress, sell, or utter any flesh during the present Lent.' Grenville's orders for his own household afford an instance of the observance of private families. Besides Sundays, only on Tuesdays and Thursdays was there 'one dish of flesh for those whose necessities require it,' and on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays no formal meal was served till after evening prayer ; but dispensation was allowed for those who could not eat fish.

Further examples of the character of Church life may be found in the development of ecclesiastical music and in the wide circulation of books of devotion.

The Restoration was a great era in Church music. Up to

the wars something, at least, of the old pre-Reformation style had survived, and with it much of the work of the musicians of the Reformation period. The Puritans were never weary of protesting against the organs and the cathedral service, 'so unedifying and offensive.' Hacket, speaking before the House of Commons on behalf of deans and chapters, admitted that he had heard that 'the service of cathedral churches gives offence to divers for the super-exquisiteness of the music,' and that 'a great part of it serves rather to tickle the ear than to affect the heart with goodness.' At the Restoration the old style had entirely passed away, and, said the writer of *A Short Direction for the Performance of Cathedral Service, published for the Information of such Persons as are ignorant of it and shall be called to officiate in Cathedral or Collegiate Churches where it hath been formerly in use* (Oxford, 1661), the persons and things relating to harmony and order 'are not easily rallied after so fatal a rout.' The writer, therefore, 'put together and published the ordinary and extraordinary parts both for the Priest and whole Quire. . . . The tunes in four parts to serve only so long till the quires are more learned and musical, and thereby a greater variety used.' The revival was fostered by Charles II., who had some knowledge of music and a great affection for the new style of Lulli. The choir of the Chapel Royal at Whitehall became the model for the whole country under Henry Cooke, whose musical education belonged to the days before the war. Pelham Humfrey, John Blow, and Michael Wise were the leaders of the new English sacred music. The great master of the school was only two years old at the Restoration, but nine years later he had composed an ode for the king's birthday. From 1667 to 1695 he wrote a magnificent series of anthems and won the place of the greatest of English musicians. Henry Purcell had, indeed, many followers and imitators, but he had no rivals.

It was not, however, without a struggle that musical services, even in cathedral churches, became universal. William III.'s Commissioners of 1689 agreed that the chanting of divine service therein should be laid aside, 'that the whole may be rendered intelligible to the Common People.' Stillingfleet's

writings show the nature of the contest that raged on this point. On the one hand, the organs were declared to be 'a Levitical service'; on the other, the use of instrumental music at all was taken for flat Popery. 'The organs' came into common use with the Restoration; and cornets and other wind instruments, as well as fiddles, are heard of at Westminster, Durham, and the Chapel Royal, St. James's. An important attempt to win the Dissenters, *Certain Cases Resolved* (second edition, 1683), deals fully and seriously with the question of Church psalmody. Dodwell's learned treatise *Of the Lawfulness of Instrumental Music in Holy Offices* (1698) is a serious vindication of what was still felt to need defence. The triumph, indeed, even of the organ was not assured without the intervention of the preacher. Two famous sermons espoused the cause of sacred music. One was preached by Towerson at the opening of a new organ at St. Andrew Undershaft, 1698. The other was preached at St. Paul's on November 22, 1699, 'being the anniversary meeting of the Lovers of Musick,' by Sherlock, the Dean. 'Does praise to God,' the preacher inquired,

'consist merely in the harmonious melody of voices, and musical instruments? Does he praise God best who composes the best anthems, or sings them best? Or do we think that we then praise God best when we feel ourselves the most Transported and Ravished with Excellent Musick, performed by the best Voices, the choicest Instruments and the greatest Masters? This is a very easy and a pleasant way of praising God, if this would carry us to Heaven.'

This might seem but an ungracious beginning; but the good Dean speedily explained that his object was merely to persuade and direct his audience 'to turn the Delights and Charms of Musick into the Raptures of Devotion, which would the most effectually silence all the Enemies of Church Music, and Cathedral Worship.' Throughout his discourse he took it for granted that the voices would be accompanied by instruments; and he treated with something like contempt the objection that singing as 'part of the Mosaical Law' was abolished. 'I see no reason,' he said, 'why men may not reject vocal prayer as well as vocal music because they were both used by the Jews.' And, as for further objections to

Church music, they were as good in David's time as now. But, on the other hand, he had objections of his own to some of the music of his day, to 'light and airy compositions, which disperse the thoughts and give a gay and frisking motion to the spirits,' and to the 'needless and endless Repetitions,' which he observed to have grown very common. Many pertinent criticisms on the duties and character of musicians he added ; and his sermon bears witness to the importance which the musical services in the great Cathedral Church of London had already attained to, and the dangers with which it was beset, when he speaks of 'very many who resort hither who, especially on the Lord's Day, crowd into the Church to hear the Anthem, and when that is over, to the great disturbance of the worship of God and the scandal of all good Christians, crowd as fast out again.' But the attraction of the sermon, the Dean was not slow to admit, remained undiminished, for those who departed after the anthem 'make room for devouter people, who immediately fill up their places, to attend the instructions of God's Word.'

Akin to the question of Church music is that of the metrical psalmody. In 1646 Parliament had substituted for the version of Sternhold and Hopkins that of 'Mr. Rous, his Psalms.' Rous, whom Clarendon disposes of as 'an old gentleman of Devonshire, of very mean understanding,' was a prominent member of each of the Parliaments of the Interregnum, but his version, except in Scotland, died with him. Sternhold and Hopkins returned with the Restoration, to suffer the sneers of Dryden, and Tate and Brady, authorized by William III. in 1696, soon took not only their place but that of the old book. The use of hymns, in the modern sense of the term, was still to come.

Books of devotion came into a new life with the ordered piety of the later Caroline divines. Bayly and Cosin were followed, if not supplanted, by *The Whole Duty of Man*. This extraordinarily popular book was published in 1657 under the protection of a letter from the saintly Hammond. It sprang almost immediately into popularity. The language used about it in almost every book of the period is laudatory beyond the verge of extravagance ; it was placed

with the Bible and the Prayer Book as the indispensable requisites of the Christian life; it was issued in innumerable editions and followed by innumerable imitations. There can be no better proof than its extraordinary success of the deep-rooted place of the Church in the affections of the people. From first to last it is a plain, sober, orthodox statement of Christian doctrine as the Church held it; it does not turn to right or left, to Geneva or Rome; it is eminently practical, decided, national, without forfeiting its claim to rank among Catholic books of devotion. Dissenters often fell under the power of its fascination; and there must have been very few households in all England from which it was excluded. Its influence can be traced everywhere in literature and life, and there can be no doubt that it was most potent in counteracting the immoral tone of the Restoration Court, as well as in confirming the deliberate attachment of Englishmen to the Church. The piquancy of an undiscovered mystery hung, and still hangs, about its authorship. A whole literature exists on the subject without any satisfactory conclusion; and, with a slight preference for the claims of Dorothy Lady Pakington, the question must be suffered to rest unsolved.

Among the many imitations which attained to popularity may be mentioned the *Ladies' Calling*, published at Oxford in 1673. In this rather dull book the duties of a Christian woman are surveyed under the heads of modesty, of meekness, of compassion, of affability, of piety; and advice is given, in a second part, to virgins, to wives, and to widows. The method throughout is that of a sober, wholesome Churchmanship, which relies upon regulated habit rather than emotion, but which finds its worship and its devotion centre in the Holy Eucharist. Its success shows the strength of the reaction against the extravagances of Puritanism, but also marks a distinct step towards the tepid sobriety of the eighteenth century, which came to regard 'enthusiasm' as a sin. Very different is the tone of the immortal works of Jeremy Taylor, which at the time of their publication had no such great success—*The Golden Grove*, *The Marriage Ring*, *Holy Living and Holy Dying*. Between these extremes of

style lie the endless examples of devotional literature associated with the distinguished names of Ken, Sherlock, Combes, Nelson, Patrick, Beveridge, Duppa, Samuel Wesley, and many more.

A notable and original exception to the general style is to be found, as might be expected, in the devotional writings of the Nonjurors. The most striking of these is the *Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices, with Psalms, Hymns and Prayers for Every Day of the Week and Every Holiday in the Year, reformed by a Person of Quality and Published by George Hickes, D.D.*, the Nonjuring Dean of Worcester. This is a work of the greatest liturgical interest, showing an intimate knowledge of ancient sources. It appears to have been compiled by a Roman Catholic; but Hickes carefully revised it, and its devotional standard does not go beyond that of the English Church. It was an attempt to popularize the Hours, and three editions show that to a great extent it succeeded; but doubtless its influence did not extend much beyond the Nonjurors. It stands apart in the large class of published prayers for families and individuals.

It is impossible to close the eyes to the effect of this literature. Books of devotion, sold by thousands, evidence the hold which the Church had upon the upper classes. Instances of special holiness confirm the impression that the influence was widespread. As might be expected, our chief records, through biographies and funeral sermons, are concerned with the Court and the nobility; but there is no reason to suppose that the middle classes were not at least as much influenced by religion as in the preceding period. The age is rich in religious biographies—too rich for a brief survey. Omitting, then, any reference to personal influences and the lives of saints, we may conclude our sketch by a short reference to the church-building of the period. And for introduction, perhaps, the material assistance which was rendered to the Church in her recovery from poverty and disendowment may fitly be suggested, in this connexion, by the Memorandum still preserved in the State Papers at the Public Record Office, that Alice, Duchess Dudley, who died

at her house near St. Giles's Church, Holborn, January 22, 1668-9,

'in her lifetime gave for the augmentation of 6 vicarages named in co. Warwick 20£ yearly apiece for ever; also to the same churches, and several others, divers large pieces of plate to be used at the celebration of the Sacrament. That she gave to the Church of St. Giles the greatest bell in the steeple, and divers great pieces of massive plate; paved the chancel with marble, built the fair blue gate at the entrance to the churchyard, and purchased a fair house of 30£ a year value for the perpetual incumbent. She also gave the hangings for the choir which cost 80£. 10s. 2 service books embroidered in gold 5£, a velvet altar cloth with gold fringe 60£, a cambric cloth to lay over it, with a deep bone lace 4£. 10s.; another fine damask cloth 3£: 2 cushions for the altar richly embroidered with gold 10£: a Turkey carpet to lay before the Altar 6£: a long screen to sever the chancel from the church, richly carved and gilt 200£; a fair organ 100£; the organ loft richly wrought and gilt, and a tablet of the 10 commandments, the Creed, and Lord's Prayer richly adorned 80£, and 200£ for placing out poor apprentices; 50£ to be distributed to poor people on the day of her funeral; 5£ to each place where her body should rest in its passage from London to Stoneley in Warwickshire, where she has a noble monument, erected divers years since of black & white marble which cost above 300£, also 6d. apiece to every indigent person meeting her corpse on the road from London to Stoneley. The rails before the altar curiously carved and gilt 40£. She also gave 100£ towards the repair of the steeple at St. Sepulchre's without Newgate, which was much defaced by the woeful fire.

'By her will she bequeathed 100£ a year for ever for the redemption of Christian captives out of the hands of the Turks; 100£ for ever to the poor of the parish of Stoneley and 7 other parishes named; 400£ for the purchase of lands in augmentation for the maintenance of the poor in the almshouse near St. Giles Church.'

This is a curious picture of the Church customs of the age. The survivals of such benefactions and arrangements are to be seen in records, or in visible memorials, within the walls of many a church to-day. They are associated very closely with the age *par excellence* of the country squire. It was an age of conservatism. A desire to maintain the *status quo* was more than ever the characteristic of the English layman's

religion after the restoration of Church and King. And in the country that meant very considerable power for the squire. The position of comparative independence which Laud would have given to the country clergy was never recovered after his fall. Family papers and memoirs all over England show the laity supreme in parish matters. Characteristic examples might be quoted from the Verney Papers or from the Diary of Sir Richard Newdigate. The latter shows the patron of a living asserting his rights with stubborn ingenuity, having the books and surplice removed from the church, locking the doors till his own minister was ready, and concealing lusty servants in the reading-desk and pulpit to dislodge possible intruders. Such proceedings naturally led to the Ecclesiastical Court, where finally the lay interest prevailed. And the papers of private families do no more than confirm the admirable sketch of Addison in the 112th number of the *Spectator* :

'My friend Sir Roger being a good churchman, has beautified the Inside of his Church with several texts of his own chusing : he has likewise given a handsome Pulpit Cloth, and railed in the Communion Table at his own expence. He has often told me, that at his coming to his Estate he found (his Parishioners) very irregular ; and that in order to make them kneel and join in the Responses, he gave every one of them a Hassock and a Common Prayer Book : and at the same time employed an itinerant Singing Master, who goes about the Country for that Purpose, to instruct them rightly in the Tunes of the Psalms ; upon which they now very much value themselves, and indeed out-do most of the Country Churches that I have ever heard. As Sir Roger is Landlord to the whole Congregation, he keeps them in very good Order, and will suffer no Body to sleep in it besides himself ; for if by chance he has been surprized into a short Nap at Sermon, upon recovering out of it he stands up and looks about him, and if he sees any Body else nodding, either wakes them himself, or sends his Servant to them. . . . As soon as the Sermon is finished, no Body presumes to stir till Sir Roger is gone out of the Church. The Knight walks down from his Seat in the Chancel between a Double Row of his Tenants, that stand bowing to him, on each Side ; and every now and then enquires how such an one's Wife, or Mother, or Son, or Father do, whom he does not see at Church ; which is understood as a secret reprimand to the Person that is absent.'

The interest of country squires in their parish churches, pushed though it was on occasion to curious extremes, undoubtedly gave great support to the movement for Church restoration, which was so marked a feature of the period. From the beginning of Sheldon's primacy the work of rebuilding and reparation all over England was seriously taken in hand. Bishop Turner's letter to his clergy and other memorials, the report of the commission appointed by Bishop Lake of Chichester, and many other visitation Charges, show how much work was done. Turner, for example, 'having found very many of the churches very sadly dilapidated, or, at least, mightily out of repair, had now (1686) pleasing accounts from many places of the care already taken to repair them.' Among the great church builders was Bishop Seth Ward, who at Exeter procured over 25,000*l.* to be spent on his Cathedral church, and at Salisbury was as lavish, but with unfortunate results. The whole history of church restoration is typified by the work done in London, and by the history of Sir Christopher Wren.

The history of the rebuilding of St. Paul's falls entirely within the period under our review. The clearing of the ground began in 1674. In 1675 the first stone was laid. At the end of 1697 the choir was first used for service. It was not till 1710 that the work was finished, based on the magnificent scheme of Wren, which the Chapter had considered to be 'the most awful and artificial' of all those submitted to their choice. Wren was the nephew of Laud's disciple, the famous Bishop of Ely and Norwich. During his long life (1632-1723) he remained a most sincere, thorough, and devoted Churchman. His work was throughout undertaken under a true spiritual as well as artistic inspiration. Like Purcell, he was a man of genius at once original and national, the founder of a school, the leader of the characteristic expression of a great age. He applied classical and Italian methods to the special needs of English worship, and on these principles developed a distinct style of his own, dignified, open, solemn, and, above all, fit for common and public worship. Wren's hand may be seen all over England. Fifty-three parish churches in London were built from his

designs; Salisbury, Chichester and Westminster had their great minsters repaired by him. But the great and characteristic work of his hand was the magnificent cathedral church of St. Paul, a triumphant vindication of his style as the most complete expression ever given to the ideal of Anglican worship as the seventeenth century desired to see it carried out.

The history of church building at this important period in English architecture is a subject of special interest. It can only here be mentioned that the Act of Parliament passed in 1710 for the building of fifty-two new churches in London was a fit expression of the widespread national interest. Only twelve churches were actually built. The magnificence of the earlier work, as in St. Paul's, St. James's, Piccadilly, and St. Mary-le-Bow, had set a standard of expense which it was impossible to reach during the wars of William III. and Queen Anne. That the spending of so much money led also to scandals, bickerings, and fraud, was perhaps inevitable; but the literature of the subject (for example, *Frauds and Abuses at St. Paul's*, and Wren's *Answer*, 1713) is not pleasant reading. The slackness which settled down upon the Church after the death of Queen Anne stayed the work throughout England; and the era of church restoration ended with the life of the last sovereign of the Stewart house.

Thus at every point we are brought up, as we close the period of our review, by the sense that a reaction was approaching, induced both by the long strain of the Puritan triumph and by the struggle of the Church to stem the tide which set in against all religious observances and against moral life. As the period draws to its end the political interests, the sharp political contests, tend to engross public attention more and more, and the disturbance of Church life was deep-seated and fraught with future danger.

ART. III.—CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

1. *Confession and Absolution.* Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace on December 30 and 31, 1901, and January 1, 1902. Edited by HENRY WACE, D.D. (London: Longmans, 1902.)
2. *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive.* Par PIERRE BATIFFOL. (Paris: Lecoffre, 1902.)

No Christian man can fail to rejoice in the candid and brotherly spirit which prevailed at the second Fulham Conference. The subject was indeed a 'burning' one, but the fire was that of love. When we are assured by opponents that the Church of England is a tangle of contradictory sects, only held together by common pecuniary interests, we may point to such a meeting as one more proof that Christian charity is a more potent bond than Acts of Uniformity.

And therefore we desire to begin our remarks with a word of earnest thanks to some of the speakers with whom we are least in general agreement—to Canon Aitken for his generous recognition of the good motives which have led his brethren to the revival of a practice to which he is opposed (p. 93); to Chancellor Smith and to Dr. Childe for their ungrudging admission (pp. 79, 80) that 'there is nothing in the teaching of the Church's formularies to prevent confession and private absolution.' We are glad that this spirit of charity did not lead the Conference to follow the mistaken precedent of its predecessor in attempting to draw up a formula of agreement. Such a formula already exists in the words of the Prayer Book, which all the members of the Conference accept, though not all in the same sense; to attempt to add a new formula would be to adopt vague phrases, too likely to become the ground of future controversies.

To some of the speakers we are indebted for suggestive remarks, and we venture to express our very cordial thanks to Father Benson. About the year 1874 the present writer

was one of a small number of priests who listened to a course of lectures on the same subject by the same teacher. What he learned then has been the foundation of all his subsequent thought on the topic. Whatever is written here is due to Father Benson's inspiration. We have no claim to make him responsible for our own development of these thoughts; but we should not be honest if we did not gratefully express our obligation.

Having said so much by way of praise, we regret that we cannot express satisfaction with the general conduct of the discussion, which seems to us fragmentary, discursive, and unmethodical. The topic suggested for one meeting was often raised again at another; and of the topics proposed for the last meeting, the *Treatment of Penitents* was very imperfectly handled, and the *Special Training of the Minister* was not touched at all. Will it be believed that the case of the incestuous Corinthian was not alluded to; nor yet the use of Confession by the Caroline divines from whom we receive the Prayer Book? We could have spared the interesting but (to our mind) purely antiquarian account given by Dr. Gee of the opinions of Elizabethan writers. We are constrained to remark that the nomination by Lord Halifax of Dr. Wace as chairman was more courteous than profitable. Not for a moment would we suggest that Dr. Wace failed in impartiality, but we are bound to say that he failed to fulfil a chairman's duty of regulating the discussion, of recalling speakers to the point in hand, and of suggesting points which were in danger of being overlooked; and perhaps he would have consulted his office better if his speeches had been directive rather than argumentative. The Speaker of the House of Commons is notoriously the member who speaks least, and least of his own opinions.

Side by side with the report of the Fulham Conference we have placed a book of a very different character. M. Batiffol rightly names his work *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, meaning by the phrase that he aims without prepossessions solely at examining the records of Church History. The second of his four essays, occupying pp. 45-222 of his volume, is entitled *Origines de la Pénitence*. He

does not touch the question of the commission given by our Lord to His Church. In the second century, when he begins his survey, the conception of the Church as the communion of saints, and of baptism as a pledge of holiness of life, was being confronted by too frequent evidence that human nature, even in Christians, was frail and fallen. How was that abnormal being, a wicked Christian, to be dealt with, especially if he desired restoration to the privileges of the Gospel from which he had been banished? M. Batiffol notices at that period a strong current of rigorism, which not only urged upon all believers the duty of abstinence from marriage and from all pleasures, but provided for those who had been unworthy of their baptism no second means of grace. 'L'encratisme est donc un esprit, non une secte, un esprit répandu dans l'Eglise même, au second siècle' (p. 53). Side by side with this rigorism there sprang up, particularly in the Roman Church, a milder view, which found expression in the *Pastor of Hermas*: 'Il n'y a qu'une pensée dans le Pasteur, qui est de rendre l'espoir du salut au chrétien tombé dans le péché' (p. 56).

In Tertullian, still a Catholic, the way of restoration is seen in a more definite shape. The lapsed Christian is urged to resort to open penance, which the African writer calls by the Greek name of *exomologesis*, perhaps because it first took regular shape in the East. M. Batiffol maintains that this did not imply a public confession of sins, but the public performance of the penance which had been awarded to them at a private confession made either to the bishop or to a penitentiary priest appointed by him (pp. 199, 211). The rule of the Church in the early ages was private confession of grave sins, public penance regulated by him who had received the confession, and, except in the case of dying persons, public absolution administered by the bishop in the presence and the name of the Church. M. Batiffol does not trace the steps by which private absolution took the place of public; but it is not, perhaps, difficult to imagine them. The change was probably due in part to the unwillingness of sinners to endure the shame of public penance—a weakness which even in the time of Tertullian kept back many offenders from

penitence. Then there was a wise caution against scandal. Although the sinner was at no time called upon to confess his sin in public, yet his penance was an open admission that he was guilty of some grave sin, and it would in many cases be easy to guess what was the nature of the offence. The dread of this mischief may well have led to the permission of private absolution, which was, as we have seen, already in use in the case of dying persons.

We would gladly follow M. Batiffol in his admirable survey of the gradual relaxation of the rigorism of penitential discipline; but it would carry us far from our purpose to do so at any length. At one time three sins were excepted from those which might hope for absolution—apostasy, fornication, and murder. These sins were regarded as those offences ‘unto death’ for which the apostle did not bid the Church to pray. Yet the Christians who had fallen into one of these were urged to do penance, in the hope that, though the Church refused to absolve them, they might meet with the unsearchable mercy of God through the intercession of Christ. Pope Callistus was probably the first to extend absolution to adulterers, and brought upon himself the scornful censure of Tertullian, now a Montanist. The like extension to apostates dates from St. Cyprian and the days which followed the Decian persecution. In another direction also the discipline of the Church was relaxed. In early days penance was only allowed once in a lifetime; a second lapse into grave sin brought permanent exclusion from communion. It seems to us probable that experience led to the mitigation of this rule. If a man fell once, and could be restored, there seemed no inherent reason why, if he fell a second time, he should not be restored again. And possibly a suspicion arose that the sins which were gravest in themselves were not necessarily the sins which indicated the greatest corruption in the offender—that the coward who denied Christ might be less wicked than the careless man who habitually ignored Him; and that it was but a rough kind of justice to pardon the latter and repel the former. Tertullian denied that the Church had authority to absolve in certain cases; the Church herself never doubted the plenitude of her

authority, but for a time, in her zeal for holiness, she abstained from the full exercise of it. When she relaxed her rules she was but developing and not altering her discipline. It is the chief merit of M. Batiffol's book that while he enforces the perpetuity of the Church's conviction that our Lord had entrusted to her the function of forgiving sins he shows how greatly her practice has varied as to the way of exercising her office.

We should be thankful if M. Batiffol had given more consideration to a point which is perhaps more likely to be raised in England than in France. If it be granted that a person detected in the commission of certain sins was excluded from the communion of the Church until he had confessed his sin privately to the bishop or the penitentiary, had performed the open penance then laid upon him, and finally had been restored by the bishop in the presence of the congregation, what was the practice with respect to those whose sins were not overt, and therefore, unless voluntarily confessed, involved no open penance? The answer to the question must perhaps be inferential rather than direct. The women who had been seduced by Marcus¹ seem to have accused themselves of sins which were not notorious; and the same remark may be made about what Eusebius tells of a disciple of Narcissus.² The scandal which led to the abolition of the office of penitentiary at Constantinople was a sin of which the priest had no knowledge until the penitent confessed it.³ We are surprised to find that the testimony of Origen on the subject is hardly mentioned at the Conference (pp. 31, 44), and very cursorily discussed by M. Batiffol (p. 109). It may be true that Origen sometimes ascribes the power of absolution rather to the spiritual man, or to the martyr whose death shares the propitiatory value of our Lord, than to him who by ordination has been appointed by Christ to be the organ of His Church in ministering His grace. But at another time he commends the sinner who 'blushes not to declare his sin to the Lord's priest, and to seek medicine.'⁴ It is clear

¹ S. Irenaeus, *C. Haer.* i. xiii. 5.

² Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 9.

³ Socrates, *ibid.* v. 19; Batiffol, pp. 149-160.

⁴ Origenes, *In Lev. Hom.* ii. 4 (ed. Lommatzsch, tom. ix. p. 193). *Sacerdos* in those days was equivalent to *bishop*.

that those who did so were not those who were compelled to this course by ecclesiastical discipline, but those who were driven to it by the stings of conscience. It could not be otherwise. It was not a sentence of excommunication, but the sin which deserved it, which really severed the sinner from Christ and His Church; and the penance was the nauseous medicine which restored him. What generous man would shirk the pain because his sin chanced to be hidden, or forego the remedy which others found salutary? We may be sure that if some were driven by discipline many others were led by conscience to seek the forgiveness of their sins by private confession, public penance, and public absolution.

If we inquire what sort of sins brought men, compulsorily or voluntarily, to this discipline we can only reach an approximate answer. They were not only those graver sins of apostasy, fornication, and murder, which at one time were excluded from absolution; for penitents, as a rule, evidently looked forward to absolution. On the other hand sins of infirmity cannot usually have required such reconciliation, for from these no man is free, and if all who committed them had been under penance the narthex would have been crowded and the altar deserted. We may conclude that from the first some distinction was drawn between mortal and venial sins, the distinction partly relating to the character of the sinful act and partly to the degree of compliance of the will.¹

The varieties of the Church's practice as to the exercise of the ministry of reconciliation turn our eyes away from mere prescription to inquire into underlying principles. Such an inquiry lies outside the scope of M. Batiffol's work, which is purely historical. It seems also to have lain outside the purview of most of the speakers at the Conference; for no one thought of asking the question which lies at the root of the matter of absolution—*What are we to mean when we speak of God forgiving sins?*

To understand Divine Forgiveness we naturally turn to the forgiveness which men exercise, or ought to exercise

¹ Dr. Strong (*Conference*, p. 49) thinks the distinction 'was probably derived from Egypt.' The list of *capitalia delicta* given by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion*, iv. 9) seems almost arbitrary.

towards each other. And at first sight the matter seems simple. A man has suffered wrong at the hand of his neighbour: at first he burns with anger and resentment, and longs to afflict the offender. In time he turns to gentler thoughts, remembers extenuations which had been ignored, sees himself in part to blame, casts away resentment, and no longer takes pleasure in the thought of punishment; and when he attains to this temper we say that he forgives. Transferring our thought to God, we regard Him as incensed by man's sin, hostile to the sinner, and set on punishing him, until (we need not here consider on what grounds) He changes His mind, no longer hates the sinner, and remits his punishment. Such a conception of God is natural to a heathen, but to a Christian it soon shows itself untrue. God never had that feeling of bitterness and thirst for revenge which even in man is found to be wrong and to need expulsion. And if God purposes to punish the sinner it is because the punishment is just and right, and therefore it would be unjust and wrong simply to remit it, as we feel it unjust in a king to grant an amnesty to criminals merely because of some happy event which has happened to himself or to his people. If the punishment was not just it ought never to have been imposed: if it was just it ought to be exacted. It is impossible, then, for Christians to suppose that God's forgiveness consists in any change in His temper, which is always perfect love; impossible also to identify it with a mere remission of penalty, unless the changed character of the offender renders the penalty no longer necessary. On the contrary, the infliction of penalty is sometimes the token of love, which sees that the penalty is itself the one sacrament of grace which will do good to the offender. Thus a father will punish his child just because he loves him. Thus St. Peter does not pray against the chastisement of Ananias; and St. Paul can deliver one of his Corinthian converts to Satan, and can wish for those who turned the law into a heresy a more than legal mutilation. Thus we find that good men, just because they are full of charity, do not shrink from the infliction of penalties which less perfect men dare not inflict, lest in their case the just retribution might be a mask for private hatred.

Again, when we have attained a temper of love towards those who have wronged us we are conscious that our work is imperfect until we have won our enemy to charity with us : our love is thwarted and wasted, so to speak, until it is reflected by him. And thus our Lord, while He enjoins on us the duty of loving even our enemies, restricts at times the operation of love as forgiveness to the cases where the offender repents : ' If thy brother trespass against thee rebuke him ; and if he repent forgive him ' (St. Luke xvii. 3).

Where the weakness of man stops short, and robs his forgiveness of completeness because he cannot bring the offender within the circuit of mutual love, there the might of God carries the work of forgiveness to perfection. We can long for the offender to be brought to a better mind : God can bring him. In other words, God's forgiveness is perfect because it is recreative. It is no change in His temper, which is always that of perfect love ; it is no rescinding of a sentence ; but His love so works as to bring the sinner to a better mind ; and, when this end is reached, love is perfected in forgiveness. Forgiveness is just one aspect of the truth of redemption ; it is not the ' sending away ' of God's vengeance, or the ' sending away ' of man's penalty, but it is, according to the literal meaning of the words by which it is commonly described, the ' sending away of sins '—*ἡ ἀφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*.

It is a common practice of Holy Scripture to illustrate sin by the parallel disorders of sickness and death, and the forgiveness of sins by the restoration of life and health. The power by which the disease of sin is expelled is the Life of Christ. ' Because I live ye shall live also,' says our blessed Lord ; ' To me,' says an apostle, ' to live is Christ ' ; and another apostle, availing himself of the symbolical language of the Old Testament that the blood is the life, affirms that ' the blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin.'

In the case of bodily disease the sick member recovers health by its participation in a body which, as a whole, is healthy. The pure blood, which courses from the heart to the suffering member, repairs its damage, expels poison, restores health. In accord with this analogy God has created the Church, the Body of Christ, to be the vehicle of the Life

or Blood of Christ to the individual members. He 'adds to the Church such as are being saved.' It would be out of place to consider here the precise nature and the limits of the Church. Nor are we bound to restrict God's forgiving grace to the visible congregation of Christian men. Wherever, in Judaism, or in heathenism, or even in atheism, we find men enabled to break free from the bonds of sin, we know that there is but one Saviour, and His life only saves, wherever salvation may be found. We regret, then, that Father Benson should have used the words, 'Real forgiveness could not be granted until after our Lord rose from the dead' (p. 12). It would, we suggest, be wiser to say that forgiveness is only given through the resurrection of our Lord, but that this resurrection is potent for the restoration of all penitents, though they may not know the source of the grace which they receive. The law could not indeed give life, still less could the worship of Zeus ; but Christ could give life to those who were under the law or under the Greek religion. Our faith in the means of grace is not that without these means grace cannot be given, but that Christ, having appointed those means, cannot fail to give grace by them.

If the real nature of Divine Forgiveness is not so much a sentence of indemnity for sins past as the cure of the disease of sin, it is clear that the chief end which it has in view is not the consolation of the penitent, but his restoration to health and service. The physician does not aim at the relief of pain so much as at the restoration of the body to its normal powers. We cannot but think that speakers on all sides at the Conference made too much of the consolation of the penitent, the bestowal of peace of conscience. Not that, for a moment, we undervalue these gifts ; on the contrary, we suppose that, when the power to overcome sin is bestowed, men will be unlikely to use it unless they are conscious by faith that they have received it ; and the assurance of having received it is the highest consolation, because it testifies to the love of our Father, who, after all our sins, still offers to make us holy. Nor do we dispute that the consolatory aspect of forgiveness is prominent in the Prayer Book, though we suggest that 'comfort' in the age of Edward VI. had a more strenuous

meaning than it has now, and implied strengthening rather than mere consolation. All that we urge is that strength rather than peace is the end at which forgiveness aims, and that the proof of real forgiveness is not the cancelling of the past but liberation for the future. To him who has, by God's mercy, received the forgiveness of sins the appropriate message is, 'Go in peace, and sin no more.'

We cordially join with the members of the Conference in regarding our Lord's commission of the power to absolve as entrusted to the whole Church, and not to any particular class or order in it. The minister is not apart from the Church, but is the organ which God has provided for the expression of the life of the whole body. We agree, also, that our Lord's words in St. John xx. 22, 23 are not to be restricted to any one function of the Church or her ministry, such as the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline or the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. We regard the forgiveness of sins as the purpose of all the dealings of the Church with sinners. She looses the bonds of sin when she baptizes her converts, when she gives the Body and Blood of Christ, when she exhorts sinners to repentance, when she instructs them in the way of serving God; she looses them also by the insensible influx of grace which she gives to her children by binding them in fellowship with her and with her holy members. But her office of forgiveness is specially indicated, though by no means exclusively fulfilled, when she readmits to her communion those who by their wickedness have been cut off. This work of reconciliation is not restricted to those who have been formally cut off from communion by ecclesiastical censure; for it is the sin itself, and not the censure of it, which severs the union of the soul with Christ and His Body; and in the present laxity of discipline many a sinner knows that he is cut off from Christ though no censure has been passed upon him—nay, by sins which at no time were likely to entail excommunication. The gravity of sin depends not only on the sort of sin, but chiefly on the wilfulness with which it has been committed. No strict line of demarcation can be drawn between venial and deadly sins. The list of the Seven Deadly Sins which is found in many

manuals should rather be headed the 'Seven Capital Sins,' because under them, as under chapters, the various sins of all degrees may be distributed. All sins, according to their wilfulness, cut off the sinner more or less completely from God; and the Church looses, or forgives, all sins by taking the penitent sinner to her bosom and infusing into him the life of Christ. The Sacrament of Penance is the open and complete fulfilment of this office. Then the Church in the most solemn manner takes back her erring member to the enjoyment of the life of Christ which is in her, and by which alone the bonds of sin can be broken.

In what way is the Church or her representative minister (whether the bishop, as in earlier ages, or the priest, as is more common at the present day) to administer the absolving grace? In early days it was usually, or always, administered by prayer. Dr. Mason says that 'no formula of absolution is recorded' (p. 32). M. Batiffol, on the other hand, speaks (p. 210) of 'les formules d'absolution publique que la liturgie a conservées,' but he does not tell us what they are or where they are to be found. Perhaps the form in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 9) may be regarded as an absolution. It may, we think, be a cause for regret that the precatory form of absolution has so generally given way to the indicative form in the Western Church, for absolution by way of prayer suggests the truth that the Church does not act as the vicar of an absent Christ but in union with a present Christ. The case of the incestuous Corinthian brings out the various persons concerned both in the infliction of discipline and the bestowal of pardon. The sentence of excommunication is to be pronounced by the joint authority of the congregation, and St. Paul as the chief minister, and the power of the Lord Jesus Christ; likewise he is to be restored by the Church in union with St. Paul, in the person (or the presence) of Christ. We are surprised to find that M. Batiffol (p. 93) endorses the assertion which Tertullian was obliged to propound because of his rigorism, that the excommunicated person in the first epistle was not the same as the absolved person of the second. We are glad to find Dr. Mason referring to Dr. Hort in support of the view that St. Paul

speaks of imposition of hands in absolution in 1 Tim. v. 22. The risk of becoming by carelessness partaker of other men's sins is more obvious if the act is one of absolution than if it is one of ordination. It is greatly to be regretted that this primitive sign has been so generally discontinued in the West, and, indeed, rendered impossible by the structure of confessional boxes. Though the open absolution of the penitent in the congregation is probably now impossible, the memory of the Church's share in the act is conserved, as well as that of the precatory form of absolution, in the words : 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences.'

No words could better express our conviction than those of Canon Aitken : 'Our Lord rises from the dead, and meets His disciples with the burden of His great salvation on His heart. He communicates to them the capacity for remitting sins' (p. 9). But we think it necessary to remind the speaker that it is the capacity for remitting sins, and not the mere office of testifying to God's remission, which the Church has received. She is the physician who actually applies the necessary medicine, not merely the medical book, which describes the remedy but does not supply it. We hardly think Canon Aitken bears his own excellent statement in mind, or is careful to harmonize his teaching with that of the Prayer Book, when he maintains, with reference to Baptism, that the priest has 'no right to tell the man that he is regenerated in the sacramental act except upon the fulfilment of certain conditions. But in penance a man is directly told that he is forgiven, and told it authoritatively' (p. 96). When an adult is baptized by Canon Aitken he is 'told, and told authoritatively,' that he is 'regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.' The minister has, no doubt, taken all possible pains to see that the man has repentance and faith, and has warned him that the richest gifts of God unworthily received will but increase condemnation ; but the minister has neither then nor in penance any power of infallibly reading men's hearts, and it is too certain that some

of those whom he authoritatively declares to be regenerate still cling to the bonds of iniquity. That the gift of regeneration is not hypothetical is evident from the fact that a man who has been baptized wrongfully and afterwards repents cannot be brought to the font a second time, but is urged to use at last the gift which he received at his baptism but has profaned and neglected. We cannot see any difference between the authoritative declaration of regeneration in baptism and the authoritative declaration of forgiveness in penance.

To be a member, then, of Christ's Body, the Church, is to be brought under the influence of the atoning blood, or life, of Christ, not only symbolized or described, but actually imparted. It was, perhaps, easier to realize this in early days, when the Church was more conspicuously holy and the world more notoriously wicked, than it is now, when so many wolves have crept inside the fold, and so many sheep wander without. In those days fellowship with the Church was felt to be the stimulating society of holy men, the sharing with them of a holy ambition to serve God, instruction in the way of righteousness, as well as participation in the life of Christ ministered through His sacraments. The exterior fellowship was felt to be the earthly counterpart of a heavenly reality, exclusion from it to be exclusion from the kingdom of heaven. This truth was expressed when our Lord assured His Church that whomsoever she loosed or bound on earth was loosed or bound in heaven. The heaven of which He spoke was no final destiny, but the present kingdom of God, of which the outer fellowship was at once a sign and a vehicle.

It is one of the most serious objections which Canon Aitken brings against sacramental absolution that a hypothetical gift is described by the most authoritative language.

'If a person does not really repent and really believe in Christ, and you absolve him, you lead him to believe that he is forgiven, when he is no more forgiven than Judas Iscariot was forgiven, and thus you build up his confidence on an utterly false foundation. Such a man's faith is a deceitful faith, and if such a man is lost the blood of that man's soul is on the head of the priest who absolved him' (p. 96).

If we admitted the hypothetical character of absolution we should still be entitled to say, with Dr. Moberly (p. 34), that 'the imperfectness of correspondence between the outward act and the inward which it only exists to signify is part of the necessary limitations of time and space, of outward and inward, to which all sacraments and ceremonies are subjected.' Those who are most disposed to assert the hypothetical character of the gift in other sacraments, who maintain that regeneration is given in baptism, and the Lord's Body in the Eucharist, only to those who come with repentance and faith, ought surely not to find it difficult to read a similar condition into the words of absolution.

But for ourselves we see no reason for thinking that there is anything hypothetical in absolution any more than we think there is in baptism or Holy Communion. The gift, we believe, is the gift of God alone, and the condition of the recipient contributes nothing to the reality of the gift, though it is all-important as to the profitable use of it. We quote with the fullest agreement some words of Father Benson:

'The ministers of the Church, acting in this power (*sc.* the power of our Lord's Pentecostal gift), act with an infallible result. There is a co-operation of the Holy Ghost with the work of the priest. The absolution may be rightly or wrongly administered or accepted; but the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, as lifting up the soul by that benediction, by that social incorporation, out of a state of death into a state of life, is what cannot fail. A man may deceive a priest; but the priest will have given a gift of the Holy Ghost, although the man puts himself into a state of incapacity for receiving it. But the gift is given. . . . The *hardness* of heart which rejects the gift does not do away with the reality of the gift, nor does the *ignorance* of the gift. . . . We must distinguish between judicial forgiveness, in which any human authority is almost certain to err, and sacramental forgiveness, which is essential in order to restore the sinner from his natural condition to the condition in which he is taken into the Body of Christ, that in that Body he may share the life it enjoys. The ministrations of that society are the real acts of our Lord Jesus Christ. The heaven spoken of is not a future heaven, but is the heaven, the present heaven of life, which Christ's minister communicates to the sinner' (pp. 14, 15).

If we may put the same thoughts in our own language—

not that any language can be better than that which we have quoted—we would say that, just as a Simon Magus might deceive even Philip, and be admitted to Holy Baptism, and by that sacrament receive incorporation into Christ's Body and spiritual life, so a sinner may deceive the priest, and receive, through the absolution which restores him to that holy fellowship, the grace by which the bonds of his sins are loosed, even though his first act be to reject the grace which he has received, and to bind on him again the bonds which have been broken by Christ. But the gift is assured by the faithfulness of God, and is not jeopardized by the uncertain fitness of men. Otherwise there would be no assurance that grace has been received. Anxious souls would always be harassed by the doubt whether they had been in a condition to receive the gift of regeneration or of absolution. Nor would the uncertain testimony of their own conscience be confirmed by the judgment of the priest who considered them fit to receive the outward sign of grace; for if in some ways the priest is better able to judge the state of the applicant than the man himself, because he is not swayed by self-flattery or by self-distrust, yet he is necessarily ignorant alike of secret sins and of secret whispers of grace. But, on the theory which we have expressed, the penitent and the priest may alike be persuaded that the grace has been given and received, and the sinner may be dismissed with the injunction, 'Go in peace, and sin no more.'

It may be urged that this view of absolution is in accordance with God's course of action in other sacraments, and explains the Lord's words, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted;' but that it fails when it is applied to the latter half of our Lord's words, when He says, 'Whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' For suppose the case (the possibility of which we freely admit) of a man truly penitent, to whom the priest, either moved by prejudice or misled by ignorance, denies the word of absolution: is such a man to be regarded as still in his sins? That the difficulty is real we do not deny, but we urge that the difficulty is in great measure that which encompasses all consideration of sin, just because sin is an abnormal thing, and cannot be expressed

in terms of the Gospel of God's love. It is, but it cannot be harmonized with the Gospel of God's will or God's purpose, just because it is in essential discord with these. But, not to press further this consideration, which needs for its discussion more space than we can spare for it, we would suggest another consideration. Suppose such a man as we have imagined: he is wrongfully refused baptism or Communion. Does he feel himself to be deprived of merely earthly things? Does he say, 'The things which I lose are merely external ceremonies which I can well do without. It is no harm to me that I may not draw near to the Lord's Table, that I may not pray with my brethren, that I am regarded by them as an outcast, and have not such help as others have from mutual advice, warning, encouragement'? We think not. We believe that just in proportion as he is a spiritual man he will feel that he is cut off from spiritual benefits. Just as the saint who is hindered from Holy Communion by sickness does not undervalue the heavenly value of that which God's providence does not allow him to enjoy, so the saint who is unjustly repelled from the sacraments does not satisfy his craving for them by arguing that they are merely earthly things without which he can do as well as with them. He will, indeed, throw himself upon the faithfulness of God, who will not cast him away; but he will confess that his loss is not only of earthly things but of heavenly. Like Father Benson, whose words we have quoted, we think the heaven of which our Lord speaks is not a future heaven, but the present operation of His kingdom. If we may, without irreverence, paraphrase our Lord's words, we take them to mean this:

'I, being risen from the dead for men, ordain My Church to be not only a witness to the heavenly life into which I enter, but also a ministrant of it. The ordinances which I appoint are not the symbols of grace only, but the actual vehicles of that grace. The Church, when she admits or restores a man to her fellowship, does really impart to him My heavenly life; when she excludes a man, she does not merely cut him off from an earthly society, but she withholds from him the means of real grace. Think not that the Communion of the Church upon earth is a mere matter of worldly policy; it is the

real working upon earth of that which I enjoy and bestow in heaven.'

If this be the meaning of His words, they do indeed vindicate the heavenly nature of earthly ordinances, but they do not prevent the hope that grace may be more widely extended than the means of grace, any more than the promise of salvation through faith in the name of Jesus Christ excludes the hope that some may be saved who have not the opportunity of knowing that blessed Name.

We maintain, then, that the office of absolution is recreative rather than judicial. There is, indeed, a judicial act involved, but it precedes absolution. As the Church is the dispenser of God's grace, and as that grace, if wrongly received, only increases the sinner's guilt and condemnation, it is the duty of the Church to do her best to avoid casting her pearls before swine, and so profaning sacred things and hurting her weak and erring children. Such a judicial function she performs when, before she admits a convert to Holy Baptism, she endeavours to ascertain whether he is fit to receive the blessing. In like manner she takes heed to warn unworthy persons from the Lord's Table. In no other spirit does she endeavour to ascertain that a person is truly penitent before she grants him the benefit of absolution. The simplest and most suitable way of doing this is to bid him confess his sins. It is in this way that confession and absolution are in practice so closely associated. It is, no doubt, within her power to absolve without previous confession, as in the case where there are sufficient signs of repentance, but extreme sickness or the lack of a common speech makes confession impossible. On the other hand, there are many reasons why confession is profitable, apart from all expectation of absolution; it helps a sinner to realize his guilt by putting it into plain words, it invites the impartial judgment of another person, it places that person in possession of an adequate knowledge of facts in lack of which his advice would be vague or else impertinent. And whether absolution is in view or not, it can hardly be maintained that the direction to confess our sins one to another means that each man is to keep his sins a secret between himself and God. The priest, in hearing a

confession, is put in the position of a judge; he learns what the penitent's sins are and is helped to decide whether he is truly penitent by his willingness to perform such penance as may be imposed on him. But having decided whether the penitent is or is not fit to receive the gift of absolving grace—a decision in which he is very liable to error, yet may look for the assistance of the Holy Spirit who ordained him for the work—his judicial function ceases; he becomes the physician who administers the requisite medicine. His fallibility ceases also, for he becomes the minister of the unfailing grace of God.

Whatever may be the differences between religious men as to absolution, there is a very general agreement that, in some form, confession is desirable. The Wesleyan has it in his class-meeting. We are sure that Canon Aitken—if we may select his name as honourably characteristic of a school—uses and advises it, and that he as a skilful physician invites the confidence of penitents before he deals with them. The medicine would not be the same for one who has been a blasphemer and for a tender and scrupulous conscience. The one he would comfort, the other he would 'persuade, knowing the terror of the Lord.'

But under this general agreement there lie important points of difference. There are some who teach that the confession to the priest should only be of those sins which lie most heavily on the conscience; and we gather from Dr. Wace's interesting speech (p. 62) that this limited confession is commended in the modern Lutheran Prayer Book. But who that remembers the close yet subtle correlation of sins, and the deceitfulness of the heart, will maintain that (putting absolution aside) such limited confession places the minister in a position to give profitable advice? We remember the case, told us by a priest who has had singular experience in the confessional, of an old man, deeply touched in a mission, whose only sin named in his confession was 'Sabbath-breaking.' A little wise and gentle questioning led him on to confess grave sins against purity, which he had not mentioned because they were long ago, and because they were only 'what other young men do.' Would it have been possible to

guide such a man to real and deep repentance if his confession had stopped short with the one sin which was heaviest on his conscience? Again, timidity might move some souls to attempt a compromise with conscience by mentioning some sins and keeping back those which involved most pain. And if we bring in the thought of confession as preliminary to the absolution of the soul by the gift of the Blood of Christ it is pertinent to remember that persons, and not isolated offences, are the object of the redemptive work of Christ.

A great deal is said about compulsory confession, but we are seldom told how the compulsion is applied. If in any parish persons are refused Communion unless they have previously been to confession, we entirely allow that the priest goes beyond the liberty which the English Church allows. We have no right to assume that a man who purposes to come to the altar is guilty of deadly sin. The Roman Church, while she requires an annual confession, allows her children to come to Holy Communion frequently without previous confession, and the Anglican Church does not authorize us to demand annual confession. But if the 'compulsion' consists in nothing more than the strenuous urging of confession, we do not see why a priest, who has himself had experience of the value of this ordinance, may not press it upon others. A priest who has been led to attach great value to total abstinence is not blamed if he urges his people with all his might to become total abstainers. If he went further, and refused Communion to a person, otherwise fit, who took a little wine, we should blame him for exceeding his authority, but not for urging on them a rule which he himself has found useful. We may think him unwise or intemperate in his views, but we must recognize that he is within his rights. What he is at liberty to do with respect to the abstinence pledge his neighbour is at liberty to do with respect to confession. Mr. Coles (p. 75) has some excellent remarks on the way in which the general disuse of confession involves a somewhat disproportionate urging of it where it is restored. Some young and zealous priests need perhaps to be reminded to keep the proportion of faith, and may be thankful for a lesson which we received from Father Lowder,

nev
prea
Sac
Gos

rep
we
had
littl
mu
tha

an
is n
obs
usel

'Is

to

sur

rule

jeal

par

obje

chil

earl

sins

har

laid

a g

if v

fit

rath

his

ens

the

Tra

me

the

—o

never to preach about confession until we had carefully preached many sermons about sin and repentance. The Sacrament of Penance is a precious gift, but it is not the whole Gospel.

For our own part, after long exercise of the ministry of repentance, the only cases of compulsory confession which we can remember are cases where parents who had themselves had experience of this means of grace left their children very little option as to using it. Canon Lyttelton, who has had much experience with young people, rightly urges (p. 71) that 'the word "voluntary" as applied to confession covers an ambiguity. Suppose the case of home training is taken : is not a kind of pressure required to ensure any Christian observance, or indeed any moral conduct at all, which yet is useless if not voluntary?' And Dr. Moberly asks (p. 82), 'Is it not a parent's duty to *press* children to say prayers, go to church, &c., and so form "voluntary" habits by "pressure"?' While we are entirely in favour of the Anglican rule which makes sacramental confession voluntary we are jealous to conserve the right of 'pressure' on the part of parents and of those who have the training of souls. The objection which some members made to the confession of children seems to us to show very little knowledge of the early age at which persons are sometimes guilty of very grave sins, and, again, of the frequent cases in which children are harassed by scruples which can only be set at rest by being laid before some wise guide. In many cases a parent is such a guide ; but we should be shutting our eyes to painful facts if we forgot that many parents are neither disposed nor fit to act as guides. Sometimes, moreover, a child will rather tell his sins to anybody than to a parent, dreading his horror or his pain, or perhaps the action which might ensue towards companions in sin.

We cannot conclude without regretting once more that the Conference entirely passed over the topic of the *Special Training of the Minister*, which was proposed for the last meeting. The need of such training was clearly shown in the stories told by Canon Aitken of abuses of the confessional — of a priest who, exercising this ministry without believing

in it, found it promoted formality ; of a priest who let belief in the ministry of absolution supersede belief in Christ ; of another priest who discussed with a bishop the reason why he had refused absolution (pp. 95-7). Sad abuses, indeed, but abuses ; and abuses which would have been less probable if priests had been trained for their awful office. If we have been comparatively free from such scandals thanks are due to the providence of Almighty God, but not to our haphazard way of letting every priest, young or old, learned or ignorant, impetuous or discreet, receive confessions. Whether we desire it or not—and we know that many good men deprecate that in which others rejoice—confessions are being heard with increasing frequency in the English Church. It is obvious that the hearing of them is legitimate, and that the practice is at any rate in certain cases recommended by the Church. It is equally obvious that many both need it and feel the benefit. How to regulate the hearing of them it would be beyond our province to prescribe. This is a matter for our rulers in the Church, who would, we are convinced, have gladly received suggestions from the Conference. The matter is by no means an easy one. The training which is required for a confessor is more than the study of a scholastic manual of moral theology. A standard of age cannot be fixed, for one man is competent at thirty, and another still incompetent at sixty ; though it would be beneficial if bishops or incumbents would restrain very young men from this arduous ministry. A foolish proposal has been made that incumbents only should exercise this ministry, for in many parishes there are assistant priests who are at least as competent as their superiors, upon whom the acceptance of a benefice confers no gift of the discerning of spirits. We believe that if a bishop were to designate certain persons as eminently skilled for the purpose, and at the same time were to forbid or discourage very young men, those who are in doubt would readily find a 'learned and discreet minister of God's word,' and those priests who were restrained would gladly shelter themselves under the bishop's prohibition if persons urged upon them a task for which they felt themselves incompetent. How gladly should we have availed

ourse
unfit
Only
of th
confe
supp
of Lo
see h

To th

50. D

51. T

52. A

53. B

54. S

XIX. T
reversed
Gardine
chester,
mitted
VOL.

ourselves of such protection when, with a burdensome sense of unfitness, we were first called upon to receive confessions! Only it is essential that any such directions on the part of the bishop should be frankly for the regulation of the confessional, and not with a side-view at its restriction or suppression. We are in the habit of looking to the Bishop of London for bold and wise regulations. May we hope to see him initiating this necessary reform?

ART. IV.—THE HOLY EUCHARIST: AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

PART VI.

To the lists of books prefixed to Parts I., II., III., IV., and V.,
add the following:

50. *De Sacra Eucharistia Tractatus*. By ADRIAN SARAVIA. The original Latin from the MS. in the British Museum, now printed for the first time. The translation by G. A. DENISON. (London, 1855.)
51. *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker*. Arranged by JOHN KEBLE. Seventh edition. Revised by R. W. CHURCH and F. PAGET. (Oxford, 1888.)
52. *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. By FRANCIS PAGET [now Lord Bishop of Oxford]. (Oxford, 1899.)
53. *Bishop Guest: Articles Twenty-eight and Twenty-nine*. By G. F. HODGES. (London, 1894.)
54. *Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth*. New edition. (London, 1839.)

XIX. THE death of Edward VI. and the accession of Mary reversed the position of theological parties in England. Gardiner was released from prison, restored to his see of Winchester, and appointed Lord Chancellor. Cranmer was committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason in connexion

with the affair of Lady Jane Grey; was subsequently tried for incontinence in having married as a priest, and a second time as an archbishop, perjury in having broken his vow to the Pope, and heresy in his denial of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament; and was eventually, with Ridley and Latimer, burnt at the stake. Becon was deprived of his benefice because of his marriage; was imprisoned in the Tower for seven months as a seditious preacher; and on his release fled to Germany. The English formularies of Edward's reign were swept away; the Latin Mass was restored; a return was made to the doctrinal position of the early years of the reign of Henry VIII. before his breach with the Pope.

So matters remained till the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth in 1558. In the following year a revised Prayer Book, which had not been submitted to Convocation, was sanctioned by Parliament in spite of the strong opposition of the bishops, and came into general use. The 'Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion' was the same as in the 'Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.,' except that the words of administration were composed of those of the Book of 1549 added to those of the Book of 1552, and that the declaration on kneeling with its denial of 'any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood' was omitted. And the rubric at the beginning of Morning Prayer directed the wearing of the Eucharistic vestments at the administration of the Holy Communion by ordering that the minister should use the authorised ornaments of 'the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.' The change in the words of administration marked the policy which was to characterize the reign of Elizabeth. The words used in 1549 were associated with the doctrine that the consecrated Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ. Those of 1552 were most congenial to the deniers of that doctrine. The combination effected in 1559 illustrates the attempt officially made to unite in the National Church those who affirmed and those who denied that the bread and wine are after consecration Christ's Body and Blood.

19
by
bis
req
yea
pre
pec
The
Eu

used
min
with
ing,
tain
dead
agre
stoli
preci
sacri

T
no a
They
form
and

I
by C
num
Conv
of th
to re
of th
ment
side a
those
came
opera

1 T
Article

In 1559 or 1560 a series of 'Eleven Articles' was compiled by Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Young, Archbishop of York, and other bishops.¹ Assent to them was required from all clergy on admission to cures and twice a year afterwards. They contained no statement about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. They declared that the people ought to receive the Holy Communion in both kinds. The ninth article, which related to 'private Masses' and the Eucharistic sacrifice, was as follows:

'I do not only acknowledge that private Masses were never used amongst the Fathers of the primitive Church, I mean, public ministration and receiving of the Sacrament by the priest alone, without a just number of communicants, according to Christ's saying, "Take ye and eat ye, &c.," but also, that the doctrine that maintaineth the Mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead, and a mean to deliver souls out of purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance nor grounded upon doctrine apostolic, but contrarywise most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and His only sufficient sacrifice offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross.'

These articles had no formal sanction from Convocation, no authority of Parliament, and no ratification by the Crown. They were designed as a temporary measure, until some formal action could be taken, and, as such, were drawn up and used by the bishops.

In 1563 the 'Forty-two Articles' of 1553 were considered by Convocation, and in a revised form and reduced in number to thirty-eight were published with the assent of Convocation and the ratification of the Queen. The object of the alterations in the articles concerning the Eucharist was to remove any condemnation of the doctrine of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, and, while condemning Transubstantiation on the one side and Zwinglianism on the other, to make it possible for those who subscribed the articles to hold any opinion which came between these two extremes. The repudiation of the operation of the Sacraments, 'of the work wrought,' in what

¹ These articles are printed in full in Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*, pp. 355-359.

is now the twenty-fifth article, and the paragraph condemning belief in 'the real and bodily presence' in the article 'of the Lord's Supper,' were omitted. In the room of the latter the following paragraph was inserted :

'The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.'

The article 'Of the perfect oblation of Christ made upon the cross' was unaltered except that 'forged fables (figmenta)' was strengthened into 'blasphemous fables (blasphema figmenta).' An article was added declaring that the laity ought to receive Communion in both kinds. A new article on reception by the wicked was in the draft submitted to Convocation by Archbishop Parker, and agreed to by that body. It did not occur in the articles as finally published.

In 1571 the articles of 1563 were sanctioned by both Houses of Parliament and were subsequently again revised by Convocation, ratified by the Queen, and issued in their present form, thirty-nine in number. The only alteration of moment touching the Eucharist was that the present twenty-ninth article, which had been struck out of the articles of 1563 between their acceptance by Convocation and the publication of them with the ratification of the Queen, was re-inserted. It declares that, if wicked persons receive Communion, 'in no wise are they partakers of Christ.'

As the articles of 1563, so those of 1571 allow of any doctrine about the presence of Christ in the Eucharist which says more than Zwinglianism and less than Transubstantiation. It has indeed been maintained that the paragraph declaring that 'the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten' 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' and that the 'mean' of such reception 'is faith,' and the article denying that wicked communicants are 'partakers of Christ,' are consistent only with the theory of Virtualism held by Archbishop Cranmer, or at the most with the Receptionism of Calvin. The untenable character of this theory is perhaps sufficiently shown by the fact that Bishop Guest of Rochester, who at

the
un
Bo
den
art
the
had

pres
and
thou
mou
carn
feel
by a
appe
Salis
that
to sa
carn
Body
after
natur

heave
my L
real p
mout
and s
taken
Christ
heave

T
Pray
out o
in a r

¹ C
Bishop
² G
24-27.

the time of the compilation of the Elizabethan Articles unquestionably believed that all communicants receive the Body and Blood of Christ but the wicked only to condemnation, though he disliked and opposed the twenty-ninth article, found it possible to subscribe it, and that he explained the paragraph in the twenty-eighth article, which he himself had written, in the following letters :

'This word "only" in the aforesaid article did not exclude the presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof. For I said unto him though he took Christ's Body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally, as the doctors do write, yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it. . . . And this that I said is so true by all sorts of men, that even D. Harding writeth the same, as it appears more evidently by his words reported in the Bishop of Salisbury's book, pagina 325, which be these :—"Then ye may say that in the Sacrament His very Body is present, yea really, that is to say in deed ; substantially, that is in substance ; and corporally, carnally, and naturally ; by the which words is meant that His very Body, His very Flesh, and His very human nature is there, not after corporal, carnal, or natural wise, but invisibly, unspeakably, supernaturally, spiritually, divinely, and by way unto Him only known."'¹

'In that in the book it is further said, "after a spiritual and heavenly manner only," some be offended with this word "only," as my Lord of Gloucester, as though this word "only" did take away the real presence of Christ's Body, or the receiving of the same by the mouth, whereas it was put in only to this end, to take away all gross and sensible presence, for it is very true that when Christ's Body is taken and eaten, it is neither seen, felt, smelt, nor tasted to be Christ's Body ; and so it is received and eaten but only after a heavenly and spiritual and no sensible manner.'²

The articles, then, as revised in 1563 and 1571, like the Prayer Book of 1559, were designed to facilitate the carrying out of the policy by which those who, like Luther, believed in a real bodily presence in the consecrated elements but not

¹ Guest, *Letter to Cecil*, dated December 22, 1566. See Hodges, *Bishop Guest*, pp. 22, 23.

² Guest, *Letter to Cecil*, dated May 1571. See Hodges, *op. cit.* pp. 24-27.

in Transubstantiation ; those who, like Calvin, rejected such a presence in the elements but maintained that faithful communicants actually received the Body and Blood of Christ ; and those who, like Cranmer, asserted that faithful communicants received the virtue and grace of Christ's Body and Blood but not the Body and Blood themselves, might all be included in the Church of England. Similarly the article 'Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross' appears to have been worded in such a way that it might be subscribed both by those who denied any sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and by those who held any doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which did not conflict with the unique and complete character of the sacrifice of Calvary or make a sacrifice of the Mass which, as a separate offering, might be parallel and supplementary to the work of Christ on the cross.

In the reign of Edward VI. a Book of Homilies for public reading in church had been published and had received a general commendation in the Articles of 1553. On the accession of Elizabeth a Second Book of Homilies was compiled. It was approved by Convocation in 1562, ratified by the Queen after some delay in 1563, and declared to 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times' in the Articles of 1563 and 1571. It is agreed by eminent commentators on the Articles,¹ and was affirmed by a judgment of the Court of Arches in 1838,² that this statement in Article XXXV. does not commit the Church of England to every part of the doctrines which the Homilies contain ; but they are of interest and importance as showing the kind of teaching which Elizabethan divines wished English Churchpeople to receive. One of them is entitled *A Homily of the Worthy Receiving and Reverent Esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*. It is marked by a strong sense of evils connected with the celebration of the Eucharist in the past ; of the importance of

¹ See, e.g., Browne, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 777 ; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 726-8 ; Maclear and Williams, *An Introduction to the Articles*, pp. 394, 395.

² By Sir H. J. Fust.

reverence and devotion and reality in the reception of the Sacrament ; and of the necessity of ministering it like our Lord and the Apostles, and the primitive Church. The statements that 'every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers,' and that 'we must be ourselves partakers of this table and not beholders of others,' appear to deprecate presence at the celebration of the Sacrament without Communion. The caution

'We must then take heed, lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice ; lest of a Communion, it be made a private eating ; lest of two parts we have but one ; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive'

apparently condemns the offering of the Eucharist for the departed ; the restriction of the Communion of others than the celebrant to the species of bread ; celebrations in which the priest alone communicated ; and at any rate some forms which the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice had taken, or was thought to have taken. Because of the sacrifice on Calvary and the promise of Christ, it is said,

'Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no Mass, no means established by man's invention.'

On the other hand, it is explicitly stated that

'in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent' ;

the effects of Communion are said to be

'the tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith, the strengthening of hope, the large spreading abroad of brotherly kindness, with many other sundry graces of God' ;

the 'meat' 'in this Supper' is described as

'spiritual food ; the nourishment of our soul ; a heavenly refecton, and not earthly ; an invisible meat, and not bodily ; a ghostly substance, and not carnal ;

it is said that

'we receive not only the outward Sacrament, but the spiritual thing

also ; not the figure, but the truth ; not the shadow only, but the body' ;

and the communicant is exhorted,

'Take then this lesson, O thou that art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend Communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou look up with faith upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with the mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man.'

It is probable that the writer of the Homily, at any rate, held a doctrine much the same as that of Calvin, and believed that faithful communicants receive the Body and Blood of Christ present in their Communion with a spiritual reality. Whether he held also that the Body and Blood are present in the consecrated elements before Communion it seems impossible to say. Nor can it be determined whether in the denials of sacrifice he meant to deny any doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, or only those ideas which were perversions of the doctrine.

It is no part of our present purpose to discuss the merits or the demerits of the policy of comprehension which was adopted in the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth. But it falls within the scope of our historical inquiry to point out that, whether or not it failed to exclude Zwinglians and advocates of Transubstantiation, it succeeded in accomplishing what it was intended to do in the way of inclusion.

Bernard Gilpin was born in 1517. He died in 1583. He was successively vicar of Norton, in Durham, Archdeacon of Durham, and rector of Houghton-le-Spring. He refused the bishopric of Carlisle. Bishop Lightfoot described him as 'the true product of the English Reformation,' 'the exponent, the noblest exponent, of the teaching of the Reformation.'¹ He was so far from being a time-server or a sycophant that the changes he made in his religious beliefs took place as was least profitable and most dangerous to himself. 'While the Reformers were in power under Edward he still clung to the old. When the Roman reaction set in under Mary he

¹ Lightfoot, *Leaders in the Northern Church*, pp. 130, 131.

espoused the new.¹ Yet he appears to have retained his belief in, and certainly was not prepared to deny, the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements.²

Adrian Saravia was a Flemish pastor who was born in 1530. After ministering in Flanders and Holland, his belief in the divine institution of episcopacy made it necessary for him to sever himself from the Protestant religious bodies in those countries. He visited Guernsey early in the reign of Elizabeth, and became domiciled in England in 1588. He was appointed Prebendary of Canterbury in 1595, and of Westminster in 1601. He died in 1612, and was buried in Canterbury Cathedral. His Latin book, entitled *A Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*, is dedicated to James I., and was probably presented to that king in 1604 or 1605. Saravia is careful to express his rejection of Transubstantiation, and of any natural process by which the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ. 'The substance of the wine and the bread,' he says, 'is not changed, and the bread remains that which it was before, as also does the wine.'³ That which is effected, he adds, takes place 'not naturally but sacramentally (*non quidem natura sed sacramento*).'⁴ His assertions that the consecrated Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ are numerous and clear, and are carried out to the conclusions that if the wicked communicate they receive the Body of Christ, and that our Lord is to be adored in the Sacrament:

'The bread without the Body of Christ is not a Sacrament, neither is the Body of Christ without the bread. The Sacrament of the Eucharist may be defined thus, that there is under the form (sub specie) of bread and wine the Communion of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ once offered for us on the altar of the cross and of His Blood of the New Testament shed for the remission of sins; and

¹ Lightfoot, *ibid.* At the same time it should be noticed that Gilpin says that after the death of Mary he 'began to explain' his 'mind more fully': see his letter to George Gilpin, written in A.D. 1571, quoted in Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, iii. 419 (edition of 1853).

² See his letter to George Gilpin quoted in Wordsworth, *op. cit.* iii. 414, 419, 420.

³ Saravia, *De Sacra Eucharistia Tractatus*, p. 77 (Denison's edition).

⁴ *Ibid.*

there is the commemoration of His death. We have here, as Irenæus teaches, the two parts which make up the whole nature of the Sacrament, the earthly and the heavenly, namely, the bread and the wine, together with the crucified Body of the Lord and His shed Blood. The third thing which I wish noted is the remission of sins and eternal life, which is the virtue of the Sacrament (*virtus sacramenti*), distinct from those two parts of it.¹

'Some eat and drink unto salvation, and some unto judgment, the same spiritual food, namely, the Flesh and Blood of Christ. . . . Those who eat and drink unworthily are partakers of the true and complete Supper of the Lord. . . . It seems to me no more absurd that the Flesh of Christ be really (*vere*) eaten in the Sacrament by the wicked than that the ark of God could be handled and carried by the wicked sons of Eli, or taken into the temple of Dagon by the Philistines and set there side by side with an idol, or than that the Son of God should be kissed by the traitor Judas and crucified by sinners.'²

'There is a fear in the present day, which has never been before, that the bread may be adored if the Eucharist be received kneeling, and people contend that the Sacraments are not to be adored. Whence comes this fear? Who has ever taught that the bread of the Eucharist is to be adored? The Pope's men themselves (*ipsi pontificii*) though they adore the bread, teach that it is not the bread which is the object of adoration. . . . They warn the people that the object of adoration is not those outward forms (*species*), which they say are accidents without subject, but that the Object of adoration is That which lies hidden under those visible forms (*formis*). The German theologians, who affirm that the very Body of Christ is in the bread, or under the bread, or with the bread, have never said that the bread is to be adored. . . . Whence, I ask, comes this fear of adoration? . . . For my own part, I think it should much more be feared that a man should not adore That which is there and then presented for the adoration of the faithful.'³

'So great is the majesty of this Sacrament that if a man by faith consider What That is which he holds in his hands when he receives the bread or the cup, and raises it to his mouth, namely, the crucified Flesh of Christ His Lord, and the shed Blood of the New Testament, and therefore the New Testament itself, shall he not be struck by wonder that such things should be, and prostrate his whole self before the throne of God's grace? . . . In my judgment, where the

¹ Saravia, *op. cit.* p. 22.

² *Ibid. op. cit.* pp. 98, 100.

³ *Ibid. op. cit.* pp. 194, 196.

true doctrine of the Sacraments prevails, there is no room for fearing any excess of reverence, either inward of the mind or outward of the body.'¹

Like the Roman Catholic theologians of the time, Saravia distinguishes between the method of the presence of Christ in heaven and that of His presence in the Eucharist, and asserts that the latter is 'divine,' 'spiritual,' 'heavenly,' 'supernatural.'² A characteristic of his position is his repeated contention that it is not the glorified but the crucified Body and Blood which are present in the Sacrament.³

John Jewel was born in 1522. The date of his ordination is not known. In 1551 he received a preaching licence. About that time, while resident in Oxford, he held the cure of Sunningwell, near Abingdon. During the latter part of Mary's reign he was a refugee at Frankfort, Strasburg, and Zurich. On the accession of Elizabeth he returned to England. In 1560 he was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury. In 1571 he died. His most important writings are his sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1560, his *Letters to Dr. Cole* of the same date, and the *Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*, the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, the *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*, all published between 1562 and 1571.

Jewel's works, like those of his opponent Harding, are marked by unseemly language and a controversial spirit, and, though learned and acute, are very painful to read. With regard to the Eucharist his position recalls sometimes that of Bucer,⁴ sometimes that of Cranmer.⁵ If there are many passages which suggest the doctrine that the faithful communicant receives only the virtue and grace of the Body of Christ, there are others which seem to imply a specific participation of Christ in heaven by means of the Sacrament.

'The Body of Christ, sitting above all heavens, is worshipped of us, being here beneath in earth. . . . The eating thereof and the

¹ Saravia, *op. cit.* pp. 198, 200.

² *Ibid. op. cit.* pp. 26, 30, 32.

³ *Ibid. op. cit.* pp. 40, 46, 52, 54.

⁴ See Part IV. of this article, *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1902, pp. 267, 268.

⁵ See Part V. of this article, *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1902, pp. 84, 85.

worshipping must join together. But where we eat it, there must we worship it; therefore must we worship it sitting in heaven. . . . Christ's Body is in heaven: thither therefore must we direct our hearts; there must we feed; there must we refresh ourselves; and there must we worship it.'¹

'We feed not the people of God with bare signs and figures, but teach them that the Sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministration thereof Christ is set before us even as He was crucified upon the cross; and that therein we may behold the remission of our sins, and our reconciliation unto God, and, as Chrysostom briefly saith, "Christ's great benefit, and our salvation." Herein we teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's Body and Blood indeed and verily is given unto us; that we verily eat it; that we verily drink it; that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of His bones, and flesh of His flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Him. Yet we say not, either that the substance of the bread or wine is done away; or that Christ's Body is let down from heaven, or made really or fleshly present in the Sacrament. We are taught, according to the doctrine of the old fathers, to lift up our hearts to heaven, and there to feed upon the Lamb of God. . . . Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the Body of Christ and drink His Blood, even as verily as His Body was verily broken, and His Blood verily shed upon the cross. . . . The bread which we receive with our bodily mouths is an earthly thing, and therefore a figure, as the water in Baptism is likewise also a figure; but the Body of Christ that thereby is represented, and there is offered unto our faith, is the thing itself, and no figure. And in respect of the glory thereof, we have no regard unto the figure. . . . We put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified. . . . We seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine not Him to be present bodily upon the earth. . . . The Body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise.'²

In Harding's *Answer to M. Jewel's Challenge* he had distinguished between the presence of Christ in heaven and the presence of Christ in the Mass in the following terms:

'The Body of Christ . . . according unto His word by His power . . . is made present in the blessed Sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine, wheresoever the same is duly

¹ Jewel, *Sermon at Paul's Cross* (Works, i. 12, Parker Society's edition).

² Jewel, *A Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*, *op. cit.* i. 448, 449.

consecrated according to His institution in His holy Supper ; and that not after a gross or carnal manner, but spiritually and supernaturally, and yet substantially ; not by local, but by substantial presence ; not by manner of quantity, or filling of a place, or by changing of place, or by leaving His sitting on the right hand of the Father, but in such a manner as God only knoweth, and yet doth us to understand by faith the truth of His very presence, far passing all man's capacity to comprehend the manner how. . . . He is verily both in heaven at the right hand of His Father in His visible and corporal form, very God and man, after which manner He is there and not here ; and also in the Sacrament invisibly and spiritually.'¹

On this distinction, thus made in terms much resembling Gardiner's words in his *Explication and Assertion of the true Catholic Faith touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar*² and following the lines of the teaching of the Council of Trent,³ Jewel pours much ridicule. It is, he says, 'a sweet mist, to carry away the simple in the dark,' 'a new-devised difference' ; to make it is to 'dissemble in dark speeches' ; it is 'a very toy, only meet to beguile children.'⁴

Five other quotations out of Jewel's very voluminous treatment of the subject may be given as representative of his teaching about the presence in the Sacrament :

'The banquet . . . is not the outward or bare Sacrament, but Christ's very Body and Blood, which are represented unto us by the Sacrament.'⁵

'The bread of the Sacrament is one thing. . . . The Flesh of Christ is another. The bread entereth only into the bodily mouth : Christ's Flesh entereth only into the soul. Without eating of that bread of the Sacrament we may be saved : without eating of Christ's Flesh we can never be saved.'⁶

'The Sacrament passeth into the belly : Christ's Body passeth into the soul. The Sacrament is upon earth : Christ's Body is in heaven.'⁷

¹ Harding, *An Answer to M. Jewel's Challenge*, op. cit. i. 480, 481.

² See Part V. of this article, *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1902, pp. 94, 95.

³ See Part IV. of this article, *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1902, pp. 274, 275, 281 ; and Part V., October 1902, p. 88.

⁴ Jewel, *A Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*, op. cit. i. 483-485.

⁵ Jewel, *The Defence of the Apology*, op. cit. iii. 473.

⁶ *Ibid.* iii. 448, 449.

⁷ *Ibid.* iii. 472.

'Bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and . . . by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given to us as that by faith we verily receive His Body and His Blood. . . . Christ doth truly and presently give His own self in His Sacraments; in Baptism, that we may put Him on; and in His Supper, that we may eat Him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by His cross and Blood. . . . Christ Himself altogether is so offered and given us in these mysteries that we may certainly know we be flesh of His Flesh and bone of His bones, and that Christ continueth in us and we in Him. And therefore in celebrating these mysteries the people are to good purpose exhorted, before they come to receive the Holy Communion, to lift up their hearts, and to direct their minds to heaven-ward, because He is there by whom we must be full fed and live.'¹

'The patriarchs and prophets and people of God, which lived before the birth of Christ, did by faith eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. . . . Whosoever believed in Christ, they were nourished by Him then, as we are now. They did not see Christ: He was not yet born: He had not yet a natural Body; yet did they eat His Body: He had not yet any Blood; yet did they drink His Blood. They believed that it was He in whom the promises should be fulfilled, that He should be that blessed Seed in whom all nations should be blessed. Thus they believed, thus they received and did eat His Body. . . . If they did eat the same meat, if the things, that is, the matter of their Sacraments were all one with ours, if their faith was all one with our faith, what difference is there between their and our eating? As they did eat Christ by faith, and not by the mouth of the body, so we eat Christ by faith, and not by the mouth of our body. . . . A Sacrament is a figure or token: the Body of Christ is figured or tokened. The Sacrament-bread is bread, it is not the Body of Christ: the Body of Christ is flesh, it is no bread. The bread is beneath: the Body is above. The bread is on the table: the Body is in heaven. The bread is in the mouth: the Body in the heart. . . . The Sacrament is eaten as well of the wicked as of the faithful: the Body is only eaten of the faithful.'²

Jewel's doctrine of the sacrifice is harmonious with his doctrine of the presence. He denies that there is on the altar

¹ Jewel, *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, *op. cit.* iii. 13, 14, 63, 64.

² Jewel, *A Treatise of the Sacraments gathered out of certain Sermons*, *op. cit.* ii. 1119-1121.

a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. He affirms a remembrance of Christ's death made to Christians in the Eucharist, and a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

'The priest in the canon . . . saith that he offereth and presenteth up Christ unto His Father, which is an open blasphemy. For, contrariwise, Christ presenteth up us, and maketh us a sweet oblation in the sight of God His Father.'¹

'This sacrifice' [*i.e.* of Christ on the Cross] 'is revived, and freshly laid out before our eyes in the ministration of the holy mysteries.'²

'The ministration of the holy mysteries, in a phrase and manner of speech, is also the same sacrifice; because it layeth forth the death and Blood of Christ so plainly and so evidently before our eyes. . . . Thus may the sacrifice of the Holy Communion be called Christ; to wit, even so as the ministration of the same is called the passion or the death of Christ.'³

'We offer up Christ, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the death of Christ. This kind of sacrifice was never denied; but M. Harding's real sacrifice was yet never proved.'⁴

'This remembrance and oblation of praises and rendering of thanks unto God for our redemption in the Blood of Christ is called of the old fathers "an unbloody sacrifice," and of St. Augustine "the sacrifice of the New Testament." . . . Our prayers, our praises, our thanksgiving unto God for our salvation in the death of Christ, is called an unbloody sacrifice.'⁵

Edmund Grindal was born in 1519. He was ordained in 1544 by the Bishop of Winchester. During the reign of Mary he took refuge at Strasburg and other places abroad. He returned to England in December 1558. In 1559 he was consecrated Bishop of London. In 1570 he became Archbishop of York, and in 1575 Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1583 he died. His opinions on the Eucharist, as expressed in his *Fruitful Dialogue between Custom and Verity*, much resembled those of Cranmer, though to some extent marked by the doctrine held by Bucer.

¹ Jewel, *Sermon at Paul's Cross*, *op. cit.* i. 9.

² Jewel, *A Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*, *op. cit.* i. 167.

³ *Ibid.* *op. cit.* ii. 726.

⁴ *Ibid.* *op. cit.* ii. 729.

⁵ *Ibid.* *op. cit.* ii. 735.

'It is not strange, nor a thing unwont in the Scriptures, to call one thing by another's name. So that you can no more, of necessity, enforce the changing of the bread into Christ's Body in the Sacrament because the words be plain, "This is My Body," than the wife's flesh to be the natural and real body and flesh of the husband because it is written, "They are not two, but one flesh," or the altar of stone to be very God, because Moses with evident and plain words pronounced it to be "The mighty God of Israel."' ¹

'Nothing is done in remembrance of itself. But the Sacrament is used in the remembrance of Christ. Therefore the Sacrament is not Christ. Christ never devoured Himself. Christ did eat the Sacrament with His Apostles. Ergo, the Sacrament is not Christ Himself.' ²

'Whereas I say that Christ's Body must be received and taken with faith, I mean not that you shall pluck down Christ from heaven and put Him in your faith as in a visible place; but that you must with your faith rise and spring up to Him, and leaving this world dwell above in heaven, putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in Him which suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty and to make you free, creeping into His wounds, which were so cruelly pierced and dented for your sake. So shall you feed on the Body of Christ; so shall you suck the Blood that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, the very true, the only eating of Christ's Body.' ³

Edwin Sandys was born in the same year as Grindal, 1519. In 1553, when Edward VI. died, he was Vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge. At the beginning of the reign of Mary he was imprisoned for nearly nine months. On being released, he took refuge abroad. On hearing the news of Queen Mary's death in 1558, he returned to England. In 1559 he was consecrated Bishop of Worcester. He succeeded Grindal as Bishop of London in 1570, and as Archbishop of York in 1576. The passages in his Sermons treating of the Eucharist contain much the same doctrine as that of Cranmer.

'We must lift up ourselves from these external and earthly signs, and like eagles fly up and soar aloft, there to feed on Christ, which

¹ Grindal, *A Fruitful Dialogue between Custom and Verity*, pp. 41, 42 (Parker Society's edition).

² Grindal, *op. cit.* p. 43.

³ *Ibid. op. cit.* p. 46.

sitteth on the right hand of His Father, whom the heavens shall keep until the latter day. From thence and from no other altar shall He come, in His natural Body, to judge both quick and dead. His natural Body is local, for else it were not a natural body; His Body is there, therefore not here: for a natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once. Here we have a Sacrament, a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure effectual, of the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . Spiritually by faith we feed upon Christ when we steadfastly believe that His Body was broken, and His Blood shed for us, upon the cross. . . . This is our heavenly bread, our spiritual food. This doth strengthen our souls and cheer our hearts. Sweeter it is unto us than honey, when we are certified by this outward Sacrament of the inward grace given unto us through His death, when in Him we are assured of remission of sins and eternal life.¹

‘In the Eucharist, or Supper of the Lord, our corporal tasting of the visible elements, bread and wine, sheweth the heavenly nourishing of our souls unto life by the mystical participation of the glorious Body and Blood of Christ. For inasmuch as He saith of one of these sacred elements, “This is My Body which is given for you,” and of the other, “This is My Blood,” He giveth us plainly to understand that all the graces which may flow from the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus are in a mystery here not represented only, but presented unto us. So then, although we see nothing, feel and taste nothing, but bread and wine, nevertheless let us not doubt at all but that He spiritually performeth that which He doth declare and promise by His visible and outward signs; that is to say, that in this Sacrament there is offered unto the Church that very true and heavenly bread which feedeth and nourisheth us unto life eternal; that sacred Blood which will cleanse us from sin, and make us pure in the day of trial. Again, in that He saith, “Take, eat: drink ye all of this,” He evidently declareth that His Body and Blood are by this Sacrament assured to be no less ours than His, He being incorporate into us, and as it were made one with us. That He became Man, it was for our sake: for our behoof and benefit He suffered: for us He rose again: for us He ascended into heaven: and finally for us He will come again in judgment. And thus hath He made Himself all ours; ours His passions, ours His merits, ours His victory, ours His glory; and therefore He giveth Himself and all His, in this Sacrament, wholly unto us. . . . To bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of His promise, to His writing

¹ Sandys, *Fourth Sermon*, pp. 88, 89 (Parker Society’s edition).

and word He added these outward signs and seals, to establish our faith, and to certify us that His purpose is most certain. He giveth us therefore these holy and visible signs of bread and wine, and saith, "Take and eat, this is My Body and Blood," giving unto the signs the names which are proper to the things signified by them, as we use to do even in common speech, when the sign is a lively representation and image of the thing.'¹

'In the time of the Gospel the Apostles had, and at this day also Christians have, their sacrifices, which, being faithfully offered, are graciously accepted in the sight of God. Sacrificing is a voluntary action whereby we worship God, offering Him somewhat in token that we acknowledge Him to be the Lord, and ourselves His servants. . . . In the Scriptures I find a threefold priesthood allowed of God,—a Levitical priesthood such as that of Aaron and his sons, a royal priesthood figured in Melchisedeck and verified in Christ, a spiritual priesthood belonging generally to all Christians. . . . Where the Popish priesthood taketh footing, in what ground the foundation thereof is laid, I cannot find in the Scriptures. Antichrist is the author of that priesthood: to him they sacrifice, him they serve. . . . There remaineth no other sacrifice to be daily offered but the sacrifice of "righteousness" which we must all offer. At the hands of the minister it is required that he feed the flock committed unto his charge; this is righteousness in him, it is his sacrifice. . . . Let magistrates . . . execute justice without fear or favour when need requireth, and so shall they offer up the sacrifice of righteousness. . . . We must all sacrifice unto the Lord with our goods, with our minds, and with our bodies. . . . Let us . . . offer Him sacrifice, as of our bodies, so likewise of our minds, repentance and praise. . . . The other sacrifice of the mind is praise, which consisteth in thanksgiving and petition. . . . The second part of this our sacrifice of praise is to pour our requests and supplications.'²

Sandys, then, certainly affirms with Cranmer that faithful communicants receive the grace and virtue of the Body of Christ; possibly allows with Bucer that they are so uplifted by faith in the reception of the Sacrament as to have actual participation of the Body of Christ in heaven; leaves no room for a sacrifice in the Eucharist other than such as there may be in all good actions, repentance, praise, thanksgiving, and prayer.

¹ Sandys, *Fifteenth Sermon*, pp. 302-304 (*op. cit.*).

² Sandys, *Twenty-first Sermon*, pp. 410-415 (*op. cit.*).

poli
diffe
Rich
it is
mean
Body
self,
Whil
opini
men
real
is no
defin
conse
the I
Praye
Trans
appro
it. H
of Tr
agree
are th
this, h

'W
whethe
Sacram
no way
our pa
co-oper
and Bl

¹ Se
Hooker
Sinc
Hooker
by Mr.
on 'Ho
Hooker
doctrine
Hooker

A philosophical and devotional basis for the Elizabethan policy of including in the Church of England the holders of differing doctrines about the Eucharist was supplied by Richard Hooker. Of Hooker's own belief about the Eucharist it is impossible to say more than that he insisted that by means of the Sacrament there is a real participation in the Body and Blood of Christ, and consequently in Christ Himself, and that, in his own mind, he rejected Transubstantiation.¹ While of set purpose abstaining from expressing his own opinions, he maintains with great clearness that, so long as men are agreed that the faithful communicant receives 'the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood,' there is no reason for parting Communion because they cannot define alike the method of that presence, or its relation to the consecrated elements. Hooker's position is rather that of the Book of Common Prayer than of the Articles. The Prayer Book, as is natural in such a work, says nothing about Transubstantiation, either in the way of approval or of disapproval. The Articles contain an explicit condemnation of it. Hooker maintains that either the affirmation or the denial of Transubstantiation is of little importance, if only it can be agreed about the elements 'that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ.' If there is agreement in this, he says:

'Why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by Consubstantiation, or else by Transubstantiation, the Sacrament itself be first possessed by Christ or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this Sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power which maketh it His Body and Blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the

¹ See the Bishop of Oxford's *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, pp. 176, 177.

Since this article has been in type a new edition of the fifth book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* with prolegomena, notes, and appendices, by Mr. Ronald Bayne has been published. One of the prolegomena is on 'Hooker's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.' Mr. Bayne interprets Hooker as having more distinctly committed himself to the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist than seems likely when the whole of what Hooker says is taken into account.

element such as they imagine we need not greatly to care or inquire. Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary.¹

But—while of the Roman, Lutheran, Calvinist, Virtualist, and Zwinglian doctrines the Articles would exclude both the last and the first, and Hooker would exclude the last two, but not the first—in the main principle of tolerating differences because of agreement on one momentous point, Hooker is the exponent of the same policy as that which characterizes the Articles. Whatever may be thought of the value of the policy itself, or of the adequacy of Hooker's theological arguments, it must at least be observed that in his work we find a fairness and depth, a dignity and force, for the equal of which, throughout the long reign of Elizabeth, we look elsewhere in vain.

¹ Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxvii. 12, 6, 7. In the *Christian Letter* Hooker was attacked for making 'light of the doctrine of Transubstantiation,' when Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, and others had died to deny it. In the MS. notes he prepared for his reply, he refers to Transubstantiation as 'false,' but reiterates that there is no reason which ought to prevent Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Anglicans from putting aside their differences in view of their agreement. See Keble's note on V. lxvii. 6. Hooker asserted 'a sacrifice of thanksgiving' in the Eucharist (V. lxvii. 12). But he says, also, that 'sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry'; and 'the Fathers' 'call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely the communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice' (V. lxviii. 2). Cf. IV. xi. 10, where he says that 'God do now hate sacrifice, whether it be heathenish or Jewish,' but also that the names 'altar,' 'priest,' 'sacrifice' may 'be retained without sin, in respect of that proportion which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by Him are abrogated.' It is a difficult, and seemingly insoluble, question whether in his assertion of 'a sacrifice of thanksgiving' Hooker meant to assert more than the Continental Reformers who used the same phrase, and whether in his rejection of 'sacrifice' he meant to reject more than some perversions of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. There is a valuable statement in the Bishop of Oxford's *Introduction*, pp. 199, 200.

(To be continued.)

ART.
CAN

1. De
2. 'G
3. Li
4. W

On th
be fou
that a
history
chaff d
works
monki
unever
day as
to the
Middle
Girald
is at t
take a
man, v
author
of the
prolific
will de
Gen
Latiniz
in or a
near T
that hi
first th
with al
gives u

ART. V.—THE LIFE AND TIMES OF GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, CHURCHMAN AND HISTORIAN.

1. *De Rebus a se gestis*; or, Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis (Rolls Series). By BREWER and DIMOCK, 1861-1877.
2. '*Gerald the Welshman.*' By HENRY OWEN, B.C.L. (1900).
3. *Life of Giraldus.* By Sir R. C. HOARE: prefixed to his translation of the *Itinerarium Cambriae*. (London, 1806.)
4. *Wales.* 'Story of the Nations' Series. By OWEN EDWARDS. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901).

ON the shelves of many a library, public and private, are to be found the bulky volumes of our early chroniclers, volumes that are rarely searched, save by the patient compilers of history in quest of precious grains of fact and truth, amid the chaff of legend and tradition. The authors of these neglected works, many of whose writings still remain imprisoned in monkish Latin, were for the most part men of peaceful, uneventful lives, who recorded the topics and politics of their day as they heard them from the lips of the various visitors to their monasteries. Among these old chroniclers of the Middle Ages there is at least one important exception, Giraldus Cambrensis, concerning whose life and aims there is at the present day a disposition among various writers to take a renewed interest; and it is with Giraldus as a Churchman, with full knowledge of the world of his time, and as the author of the last attempt to assert the ancient independence of the Welsh Church, and not as the historian of Wales and prolific writer on ecclesiastical lore, that the ensuing sketch will deal.

Gerald de Barri, to give him his real name, and not the Latinized form of it by which he is usually known, was born in or about the year 1146, at his father's castle of Manorbier, near Tenby in South Wales, and died in the year 1223, so that his whole life covers, roughly speaking, the reigns of the first three Plantagenet kings, Henry II., Richard I., and John, with all of whom he was brought into close contact. Gerald gives us in his autobiography, the *De Rebus a se gestis*, so

loving and minute a description of his birthplace, 'the sweetest spot in Wales,' that the many travellers who visit the ruins of Manorbier Castle, still numerous and magnificent in their decay, have little difficulty in recognizing at the present day many of the features both of the pile itself and of the landscape described six hundred years ago by the famous Churchman and historian born within its walls. He was the youngest son of William de Barri, lord of Manorbier, the head of one of the great Anglo-Norman families which had obtained large grants of land in South Wales under Henry I. Following the usual custom of these noble settlers, William de Barri had allied himself with the old princely stock of South Wales by marrying Angharad, daughter of Gerald de Windsor, whose wife had been the frail and beautiful Nesta, 'the Helen of Wales,' daughter of Prince Rhys ap Tudor, killed in battle by the English in 1093. It is of particular importance, in dealing with Gerald's policy and motives throughout his stormy and ambitious career, ever to bear in mind that he was, however remotely, a true descendant of a former Welsh sovereign-prince; for in this lineal descent from Rhys ap Tudor, though occurring twice through the female line, is often to be found the key to his ecclesiastical aims, and also to the ceaseless opposition of the English Crown to them.

At the time of Gerald's birth the whole country was passing through very troublous times. Whilst England was being devastated by the war raging between King Stephen and the Empress Maud to such an extent that the ignorant were wont to declare openly that 'Christ and His saints were sleeping,' the condition of Wales was little better, since the absence of a strong king on the English throne had helped as usual to rouse the Welsh princes to rebellion, and the Norman lords of South Wales were in consequence hard pressed. The earliest years of Gerald's life were, therefore, spent amid continual alarms and forays, the castle of Manorbier itself being at one time threatened with a siege, on which occasion the boy begged to be carried from the castle to the lonely little church hard by, declaring he would be far safer from foes beside God's altar than within the strong

walls
insta
eccle
roun
stock
absor
Whe
the
figur
and
did
unma
encor
only
noble
David
help
son's
great
kinsm
perha
allusi
uncle
and
educa
first
on hi
logica
To P
three
indust
own l
In
ordain
twenty
script
as lau
arrog
given

walls of his father's fortress. Nor was this petition the only instance in which as a child the future chronicler showed the ecclesiastical bent of his mind. In spite of his warlike surroundings, and in spite of his descent from such fighting stock as the de Barris, Gerald was from his tenderest years absorbed in priestly studies, and even in priestly games. When his brothers and childish companions used to trace on the hard yellow sand of the Pembrokeshire shore rude figures of arms and of warriors, Gerald invariably drew crosses and other religious symbols. His father, strange to relate, did not attempt to deride the child's fancies or to call him unmanly, but nicknamed him in jest his 'little bishop,' and encouraged him to seek his fortunes in the Church, then the only career save that of arms open to the son of a great nobleman. Possibly, the fact that his own brother-in-law, David Fitz-Gerald, was then bishop of St. David's may have helped to reconcile the lord of Manorbier to his youngest son's unusual choice, for in those days of clerical nepotism a great family did not care to see the wealth and power of a kinsman in the Church pass into alien hands at his death; perhaps even his father's pet name was meant as a distant allusion to Gerald's chances of some day succeeding to his uncle's position. Destined, therefore, by his own inclinations and by the consent of his father to the Church, Gerald's education was entrusted to the care of this same uncle, who first sent him to St. Peter's Abbey at Gloucester, and later, on his reaching man's estate, counselled a course of theological studies in Paris for his nephew and expected successor. To Paris, accordingly, Gerald was sent, and there he remained three years, giving abundant evidence not only of exemplary industry, but also of a lively belief, not to say conceit, in his own learning and capabilities.

In 1173 Gerald, on his return from Paris, is at once ordained priest by Archbishop Richard, being then some twenty-seven years of age. Ambitious and not over-scrupulous, but singularly free from avarice and greed, virtues as laudable as they were rare in those days; violent and arrogant, yet zealous and untiring in duty; intolerant and given to stigmatize all who disagreed with his views as fools,

and all who opposed them as knaves acting from the basest motives, yet always generous and sincere: such was Gerald at this period. With regard to his attainments, he was an excellent Latin scholar, writing and speaking the language of the learned world with ease; he had a full knowledge of English and of French, but of Welsh, the language of the country whose ecclesiastical independence he was destined to assert so vigorously, he was partially ignorant, so that he was never able to preach in that tongue. Witty and learned, Gerald was moreover frugal, virtuous, and orthodox. In appearance he was undoubtedly tall and handsome, as a *de Barri* should be, though he lauds his personal beauty in terms that even Benvenuto Cellini, that vainest of self-historians, would have hesitated to use:

‘I went to see Baldwin, then Bishop of Worcester, at Blockley. I was then young, tall, and as remarkable for beauty of face (that perishable and transitory gift of Nature) as for elegance of figure. Being seated at the bishop’s desire near him, one Serlo, an abbot of the Cistercian order, who sat on the other side, having eyed me for some time, exclaimed, “Do you think it possible that so beautiful a youth can ever die?”’¹

In spite of his egotism and overweening vanity, Gerald’s prospects in the career he had chosen for himself were most favourable; and had he only pursued an even course, instead of aiming at a petty end aside from the public good, he might with his undoubted talents and his powerful interests have risen eventually to the highest offices in Church and State, and his name have been transmitted to posterity in the company of such illustrious men as Lanfranc, Anselm, or Stephen Langton. Unfortunately, however, Gerald had always regarded himself as the certain successor to his uncle in the bishopric of St. David’s, and he had long determined when that day arrived to assert the obsolete claims to metropolitan rank of that see. A natural desire to increase the importance of the diocese which he considered peculiarly his own, a genuine though misplaced sense of patriotism to the land of his birth, and, above all, an incredible pride in his descent from Prince Rhys of Wales, are the chief reasons to

¹ *De Rebus a se gestis*.

accor
deepl
easy
Henr
S
Richa
uncle
condi
bisho
down
righte
his u
ripe
truste
the bi
were
their
paym
as he
far re
Pemb
promp
conten
Haver
ginally
genero
had s
Englis
mission
clergy
many
deacon
his wi
Llandu
zeal th
himsel
and ye
deacon
dealt v

account for this determination. How early in his career this deeply rooted ambition manifested itself openly it is not easy to say; but soon after his return from Paris we find Henry II. suspicious and alert as to his designs in Wales.

Such was the young ecclesiastic whom Archbishop Richard now invested with legatine authority to assist his uncle in the management of his vast and turbulent see, the condition of St. David's being so distressful that the archbishop was only too glad to send Gerald with special powers down to South Wales. With all the energy of youth and of righteous enthusiasm, Gerald seems to have descended into his uncle's diocese like a firebrand dropped into a field of ripe corn. Armed with the special legatine authority entrusted to him, Gerald was soon travelling in all parts of the bishopric with unflagging energy. Clergy and laity alike were made to smart under his reforms, the former chiefly for their non-celibacy, and the latter for their persistent non-payment of tithes due to the Church. Gerald was fearless as he was tireless, so that no offender was too powerful or too far removed for him to pass over; even the Castellan of Pembroke Castle, the chief royal official in South Wales, was promptly excommunicated by the fiery young priest for a contemptuous refusal to pay tithe! The Flemish settlers in Haverfordwest and its neighbourhood, who had been originally planted in this part of Wales by Henry I., with royal generosity—at the expense of the Welsh natives—and who had so far defied equally the Welsh clergy and the English barons, were terrified by Gerald's threats into submission and into payment of their dues. Nor did the married clergy suffer less than the tithe-withholding laity. With many others Gerald excommunicated the aged Jordan, archdeacon of Brecon, on the old man's spirited refusal to renounce his wife, expelling him forcibly from his dwelling-house of Llanduw, near Brecon, and demanding as a reward for his zeal the bestowal of the unfortunate archdeacon's offices on himself, a request that was immediately granted. Another and yet more daring deed was achieved by Gerald, now archdeacon of Brecon, in these early days. As he had so far dealt with both priest and layman without fear or favour,

Gerald was not in the least afraid of a bishop, and when a pending dispute between Adam, bishop of St. Asaph, and his uncle over the patronage of a border-parish in Montgomeryshire, called Kerry, ended in the former prelate's announced intention of forcibly seizing the parish church in question, Gerald, on his uncle's behalf, determined to frustrate this design at any cost. Hastening with a band of followers from Brecon, Gerald contrived to reach Kerry early in the morning before his opponent's arrival. Having said Mass in the church, he awaited the appearance of the Bishop of St. Asaph, who on reaching the place was naturally incensed at the intrusion of the youthful but intrepid archdeacon. After mutual recriminations in the building itself, bishop and archdeacon, with their respective trains, adjourned to the churchyard, where each proceeded to excommunicate the other as an intruder, Gerald's sentence being followed by the ringing of the church bells. Finally, the archdeacon and his men assisted by the populace of Kerry, drove off his lordship of St. Asaph amid jeers and a shower of stones and clods of earth, nor did the discomfited prelate ever again venture to claim the patronage of Kerry. The story of how the young Welsh archdeacon bested the bishop soon found its way to the English Court, where many of Gerald's relations were well known, and it is said that the great Henry II. was much amused at the tale, though this example of violent, almost lawless conduct, did not tend to make him regard the author of it with increased favour or confidence, but rather with suspicion and dislike.

But if the behaviour of Gerald at this period was too often arrogant and hasty, it was acknowledged, even by his enemies, who were already numerous, that his care of the souls of those under his special charge was most exemplary. No duty was ever postponed or prevented by the dangers of the road, by long distance, or by bad weather; nor were the poor and humble in his eyes of less consequence than the powerful and wealthy. As an instance of this devotion to work it is related that, being on one occasion anxious to cross Milford Haven so as to visit Angle, one of his own parishes, Gerald, in spite of remonstrances from his uncle, insisted on crossing the

Have
obs
unm
S
year
four
uncle
of wh
strat
see l
bisho
relati
there
St. I
vacan
bisho
only
obtai
disap
king
a cho
Crow
Henr
king
disco
ceiv
capa
undo
diffi
had a
hand
The
roug
Ages
with
a W
patri
royal
when

Haven during a furious storm, at the peril of his life, merely observing that 'when business demanded attention, it was unmanly to watch the state of the weather.'

Such were the character and position of Gerald in the year 1176 when his uncle Bishop David died. For nearly four years, with the archbishop's consent, he had been his uncle's right-hand man in the diocese, the spiritual condition of which had greatly improved under his energetic administration. There can be little doubt that all throughout the see looked upon the reforming archdeacon as their future bishop, to which position his talents, his orthodoxy, and his relationship to Bishop David seemed to entitle him. It was, therefore, no matter for surprise to any that the Chapter of St. David's should at once elect Gerald unanimously to the vacant see, though he was but thirty years of age. Archbishop Richard having already signified his approval, there only remained the royal ratification of the election to be obtained. But here a bitter, and probably quite unexpected, disappointment met the new bishop-elect of St. David's; the king refused to allow the election on the grounds that such a choice would be detrimental both to the interests of the Crown in Wales and to the supremacy of Canterbury. Henry II., first and wisest of the great line of Plantagenet kings, was a thorough judge of character, and he had quickly discovered the secret ambitions of the young archdeacon, perceiving, more clearly than his own archbishop, Gerald's capacity for withstanding English influence in Wales and for undoing much of the work wrought there with such care and difficulty both by Crown and Church in the past. The king had apparently for some time been watching Gerald's high-handed methods in his uncle's diocese with much misgiving. The story of his violence at Kerry had amused Henry, as rough jests of that description moved to mirth in the Middle Ages, but with his memory fresh from the recent struggle with Thomas à Becket, the king was determined not to allow a Welsh national prelate of the type of Gerald, young, patriotic, virtuous, and, above all, the possessor of a Welsh royal descent, to arise in Wales and defy the English Crown when opportunity offered. Nor did Henry conceal the

reasons for his refusal, though Gerald openly disavowed any intention of setting up claims against either English king or archbishop. For some little time the argument between Henry and the new bishop-elect of St. David's continued, till at length the king, growing weary of the controversy, first threatened to deprive the canons of St. David's of their benefices, and then summoned the whole Chapter from Wales to make a new election under his own supervision. The result was as might have been expected under so powerful a monarch as Henry: Gerald, 'unwilling to persist in opposition to the will of the king, and the canons, not wishing to lose their benefices, abandoned their claims and a new election was made in the presence of the king at Winchester.' Peter de Leia, the Clugniac prior of Wenlock, was duly elected bishop at the royal command, which at the same time forbade the nomination of any Welshman.

Foiled in his first attempt to obtain the coveted see, yet submitting with a good grace to Henry's decision, Gerald now betook himself to Paris, where he soon renewed the old ties broken off a few years before. Here he lectured in the schools, and as usual is not sparing of self-praise, telling us in his autobiography of the crowded and attentive audiences that never wearied of his discourses. After some three years spent thus amid the learned society of Paris, Gerald returned to England at the request of the archbishop in 1180. On his way to London he was entertained for some days by the monks at Canterbury, where the ascetic archdeacon was much scandalized at the luxurious living in vogue there, telling us that the brothers invariably drank foreign wines at their meals and despised good English ale. On reaching London the archbishop received Gerald warmly, begging him to proceed to Wales at once and assist Bishop Peter de Leia, a commission that Gerald was only too pleased to undertake. On his arrival at his beloved St. David's he found the bishop departed, and the whole see in great confusion, so that the work of administering the diocese again devolved upon the archdeacon, as it had in his uncle's lifetime. It was probably due to Gerald's initiative and to his characteristic energy that the present cathedral of St. David's, the only fine pile of

eccles
Henry
Wales
mand
to Co
tribut
withd
who h
of a
pointe
John,
ment,
Court
both t
uncon
Fitz-G
Barry
positi
and I
scopar
offer c
was oc
the co
1187,
works
freshe
deacon
idea o
ments
In
Crusac
Henry
distrus
his cap
act as
cessor
visitati
'Th
officials

ecclesiastical buildings still existing in Wales, was now begun. Henry II., however, still did not regard Gerald's presence in Wales with any favour, and in 1184 Bishop Peter was commanded to return to his diocese, while Gerald was summoned to Court to take up the duties of a royal chaplain, partly as a tribute to his learning and zeal, and partly as a means of withdrawing him from Wales. In the following year Henry, who highly approved of Gerald in every capacity, except that of a possible aspirant to Welsh metropolitan honours, appointed his new chaplain to be tutor and secretary to Prince John, recently created Lord of Ireland. In this employment, which he greatly preferred to the irksome duties of a Court chaplain, Gerald acquitted himself with full satisfaction both to Prince John and to the king; nor was Ireland itself uncongenial to him, since his relatives, the de Barris and Fitz-Gerals (the ancestors of the existing Irish families of Barry and Fitzgerald), owned vast estates and held high positions there. During this visit the bishoprics of Waterford and Leighlin were offered to and refused by him; *nolo episcopari* was throughout life Gerald's rule with regard to the offer of any mitre save that of St. David's. His spare time was occupied in composing two works on the topography and the conquest of Ireland, and on his return to England in 1187, Gerald read aloud at Oxford the former of these works on three consecutive days, the audience being refreshed from time to time by food and drink at the archdeacon's own expense, a three days' literary symposium, the idea of which was probably copied from the bardic entertainments then in vogue among the Welsh princes.

In the following year the announcement of the Third Crusade again brings Gerald into Welsh public life, for Henry, having by this time apparently lost much of his distrust and dislike of his new chaplain, and well knowing his capacity for dealing with Welsh affairs, appoints him to act as guide and secretary to Archbishop Baldwin, the successor of Richard, in a proposed 'itinerary' or ecclesiastical visitation of all parts of Wales:

'The expedition was not without its political reasons. The royal officials had an opportunity of surveying the country not possible

under any other circumstances ; the religious conscription would send to Palestine many of the King's enemies ; and the metropolitan of the English Church would have the opportunity of asserting his still not undisputed rights by celebrating Mass in each of the four cathedrals of Wales.¹

In 1188, therefore, Archbishop Baldwin, accompanied by the celebrated Ranulph de Glanville, first of English writers on jurisprudence, and by a large train of ecclesiastics and warriors, set out from Hereford on this half-religious, half-political mission :

'The sages of the Church and of the Law were under the guidance of a young man, tall, slender in figure, with delicate features overshadowed by large wide eyebrows ; a man of learning and a wit, but self-sufficient, conceited, and an intolerable egotist.'²

The English train, entering Wales, met Prince Griffith at Radnor, where with his customary enthusiasm Gerald declared himself the first Welshman to take the Cross, and from Radnor it proceeded in a southerly direction towards Llandaff, passing Brecon and Llanduw, Gerald's own residence, on the way. From Llandaff the archbishop made his way along the coast of South Wales to St. David's (whose fame as a place of pilgrimage was now declining in favour of the newly founded shrine of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury), and from St. David's along the Pembrokeshire coast-line to Cardigan. From Cardigan the great cavalcade made its way up the wild valley of the Teifi to the abbey of Strata Florida, reaching the sea-shore again at the old cathedral city of Llanbadarn. Thence it made its way along Cardigan Bay to Bangor and St. Asaph, through North Wales to Chester, and from Chester back to Hereford. In this manner the four cathedral churches of Wales were visited by the archbishop, and one object at least of this 'itinerary' was fully accomplished.

The success of this visitation Gerald attributes solely to his own eloquence, informing his readers that the Welshmen flocked in thousands to hear his sermons and to take the Cross as a result of his fervid addresses—not in Welsh, in

¹ Henry Owen : *Gerald the Welshman*.

² Dean Hook : *Lives of the Archbishops*.

full
Lati
way
its y
of th
their
cares
know
the c
to hi
and n
partic
Princi
A
which
with t
join th
by fan
Gerald
Prince
influenc
Accord
Baldw
histori
Holy L
Ranulph
before
sensati
thankfu
moved
ambitio
comman
the cur
wealthy
was, mo
Rich
of favor
William
Palestin

full knowledge of which he was always deficient, but in Latin! Prince John, he tells us, was deeply vexed at the way in which his preaching had denuded all South Wales of its young men in their eagerness to join the Crusade, in spite of the efforts of their womenkind to prevent them, 'following their innate evil heart.' Notwithstanding his duties and cares, Gerald found time during this period to write his best-known and most valuable work, the *Itinerarium Cambriae*, the compiling of which must have been particularly congenial to him; 'a work which, amidst a multitude of idle stories and monkish legends, contains many curious and interesting particulars relative to the topography and history of the Principality.'

At the conclusion of this curious and interesting mission, which lasted some twelve months, Gerald set off in company with the king, the archbishop, and Ranulph de Glanville, to join the Crusade; but before proceeding far, Henry, worn out by family intrigue, died at the all-too-early age of fifty-seven. Gerald was now hastily summoned back to England by Prince Richard, now king, in order that he might use his influence in keeping the Welsh quiet at this critical period. Accordingly, he bade farewell to his old friend and patron Baldwin, who had previously arranged for Gerald to become historian of the Crusade, and left him to proceed alone to the Holy Land, whence he never returned, dying, together with Ranulph de Glanville, in the plague-stricken English camp before Acre. In all probability Gerald, notwithstanding his sensational taking of the Cross at Radnor, was only too thankful to avoid the Crusade itself, which would have removed him for an indefinite time from the centre of his ambition—Wales; so that he gladly obeyed King Richard's command, obtaining absolution from his crusading vows on the curious plea of poverty and old age, though, if not wealthy, he could scarcely well describe himself as poor, and was, moreover, barely forty-four years of age.

Richard received Gerald on his arrival with every mark of favour, and appointed him to act in Wales as coadjutor to William Longchamp, bishop of Ely, during his absence in Palestine. The mitres, first of Bangor and then of Llandaff,

were about this time offered to him ; but Gerald refused both, alleging his unwillingness to accept any position that would tend to interfere with his duties and studies, but really, one is inclined to suspect, from a sanguine hope of obtaining the see of St. David's as soon as it should again become vacant, an event which its bishop's age and ill-health made imminent.

On Richard's departure, Gerald soon began to disagree and quarrel with the unscrupulous and rapacious William Longchamp, in consequence of which he retired to Lincoln, where the learned and gentle St. Hugh was then bishop. Prevented, owing to the war then raging between Philip and Richard, from again visiting Paris, Gerald spent over six years of his life at Lincoln, writing or correcting his first six works, and also waiting for a favourable opportunity to occur with regard to St. David's.

At length the event for which Gerald had waited so long and so patiently came to pass in 1198, when Bishop Peter's death again left the see of St. David's vacant. No sooner had the necessary mandate for election been issued than the canons, who were doubtless in communication with Gerald at Lincoln, immediately nominated four candidates, the name of Gerald being placed first ; the second and third names being those of two Welsh archdeacons, and the fourth that of Reginald Foliot, an Englishman. On this list being submitted to him, Archbishop Hubert Fitz-Walter, Baldwin's successor, at once declined to accept Gerald's nomination, assigning for his refusal the identical reasons that Henry II. had given some twenty years before. Gerald, nothing daunted, appealed to the king, knowing him to be well disposed towards him, and Richard, who was then in Normandy, ordered the attendance of four of the canons at Rouen. After some delay, two members of the Chapter of St. David's set out to seek the king, but before their arrival Richard was already dead, having in the interval received his death-wound at the castle of Chalus. Had he lived it is quite possible that, in spite of Archbishop Hubert's remonstrances, the election might have been ratified by the king out of his personal regard for Gerald—an act which would undoubtedly have had very important results in Wales.

Gera
appe
credi
at fir
howe
defin
to th
electi
nor co
decisi
for th
refusa
to reti

'H
fruitl
withou
literatu
a Cour
became

Th
for, ins
to St.
delight
reserve
to app
Chapte
Gerald
for Ro
election
claims
Welsh
demand
to Irela
step, set
Novemb
We
where th

Gerald, greatly disappointed, but still full of hope, now appealed to the new king, and John, though generally credited with absolute ingratitude for past services, seemed at first disposed to grant his old tutor's request. He had, however, the wisdom to consult with the Archbishop before definitely allowing the election, and on Hubert's warning as to the possible dangers that might arise in Wales, were the election sanctioned, John decided to refuse Gerald's request, nor could any arguments of the latter avail against the royal decision. Worn out at last by his long years of waiting for the expected prize, and utterly dejected at this second refusal of it, Gerald at first seems to have made up his mind to retire from the world to study and to live at leisure :

'Hitherto I have unfortunately sacrificed too much time to fruitless ambition. Let me therefore be allowed to retire and indulge without further molestation my favourite pursuit of books and literature. Let others anxiously covet the high honours attached to a Court, as I myself, labouring under the same vice, once did, and became an useless and unprofitable follower of it.'¹

This wise resolution, however, Gerald never carried out ; for, instead of retiring from public life, he proceeded at once to St. David's, where he was received with enthusiastic delight by the clergy and populace. Throwing now all reserve and prudence to the winds, Gerald boldly determined to appeal directly to the Pope. In face of this resolve, the Chapter once more met and unanimously elected Gerald, and Gerald alone, for bishop, beseeching him to start immediately for Rome, not only to procure a ratification of his own election, but also to assert before the Pontiff the metropolitan claims of St. David's and the ancient independence of the Welsh Church. The bishop-elect gladly assented to these demands of the Chapter, and, having first paid a rapid visit to Ireland to consult with his powerful relatives there on this step, set out on his important mission, and reached Rome in November 1199.

We now come to the culminating point in Gerald's career, where the ambitious schemes he had hitherto nursed in secrecy

¹ *De Rebus a se gestis.*

against the day of his election and appointment to the see of St. David's, merge into the final and open struggle of the moribund national Church of Wales against the supremacy of Canterbury. The unequal combat lasted exactly four years, and ended in a complete and lasting victory for the English Metropolitan. In some ways the time was favourable to the Welsh. Llewellyn ap Iowerth, known even to the English as 'the Great,' was now Prince of Wales, and this enlightened monarch 'undoubtedly sympathized with the belated attempt of Giraldus to regain the independence of the Welsh Church, though he does not seem to have tried to appoint the bishops: such an attempt would have brought him into open rupture with the Pope and with the King of England.'¹ Could Gerald have contrived to enlist not only the sympathy, but also the firm support of this prince, who later was absolved by the Pope from his oath of allegiance to his excommunicated suzerain, John, his efforts might have eventually proved successful, though the Welsh clergy themselves, as Gerald ruefully admits, were half-hearted and timorous throughout the whole struggle. Indeed, the majority of the Welsh priesthood were no great admirers of this champion of their Church, whose drastic administration of the diocese of St. David's they recalled with anything but pleasure and gratitude, preferring their old, easy-going, unorthodox ways to the new methods of discipline and of Roman obedience forced upon them by Gerald in his earlier days of power; they remembered also that Gerald was less than half a Welshman by birth, and that he was, moreover, partially ignorant of the language of Wales. The bulk of the Welsh clergy thus holding aloof, and the Prince of Wales sympathetic but not active in his behalf, Gerald grew to look for support to the lesser chieftains of Wales, notably to Gwenwynwyn, Lord of Powys, who openly claimed the bishop-elect of St. David's as a fellow-fighter against the might of England, and applauded his *rebellis audacia*, as Gervase of Canterbury styles Gerald's movement in Wales. With the English king and archbishop thus arrayed against him with all their resources, with the sovereign-prince of Wales neutral,

¹ *Wales*, 'Story of the Nations.'

with
such
Gera
Wels
such
the
belie
persu
succe
T
under
had r
to ma
with
who e
this e
Domi
nizer
of Cor
and an
of so p
so des
the hei
out W
contain
church
face of
Emper
One c
must h
Rome
mingles
Before
present
'praesta
of whic
at his
praise.
librae c

with the Welsh clergy half-hearted or even hostile, and with such poor support as the lesser chieftains could give, did Gerald carry on his four years' struggle for the rights of the Welsh Church and incidentally for his own election ; under such circumstances it must have been a strong conviction of the righteousness of his cause, coupled with a marvellous belief in his own almost unaided powers, that could have persuaded Gerald that his suit was ever likely to meet with success either in Wales or at the Papal Court.

The power of the mediaeval papacy was then at its zenith, under the greatest of all the early pontiffs, Innocent III., who had recently been elected to the chair of St. Peter. Perhaps to many it will appear the most interesting fact in connexion with Gerald that he should have been the only Englishman who ever obtained any degree of familiarity or friendship with this extraordinary man, the patron of St. Francis and St. Dominic, the destroyer of the Albigensian heretics, the organizer of the Fourth Crusade, with its terrible siege and sack of Constantinople, and of course the conqueror of King John and arbiter of the liberties of England. As the chief residence of so powerful a Pope, the palace of the Lateran, so curtailed, so deserted, and so modernized in our own days, was also at the height of its fame and splendour, drawing all men throughout Western Christendom to its vast group of buildings that contained not only the papal palace itself, but the cathedral church of Rome, 'the mother and head of all churches on the face of the earth,' and also the ancient baptistery wherein the Emperor Constantine had been baptized by St. Sylvester. One can imagine how the enthusiastic archdeacon's heart must have thrilled with joy and wonder on his arrival in Rome at the sight of such magnificence, and with what mingled hopes and fears he approached the papal throne. Before pleading his cause Gerald did not shrink from first presenting to the pontiff his own six works, with the words '*praestarent vobis alii libras, O Papa, sed nos libros,*' all of which six volumes, he tells us, Innocent read carefully at his leisure, selecting the *Gemma Ecclesiastica* for special praise. In spite of the Pope's acknowledged preference for *librae* over *libri*, Gerald was received at the Lateran with

great favour, a fact which was all the more remarkable since Archbishop Hubert had anticipated his opponent's arrival in Rome by trusty messengers who had brought, besides information more or less accurate of Gerald's designs, large sums of money for the papal treasury and promises of further supplies. Before the Pope's first good impression could wear off, however, Gerald was quick to perceive the universal venality of the Papal Court and to act accordingly:

'As in the days of Juvenal—*Omnia Romae cum pretio*—Gerald, besides his books, had promises to offer, Peter's pence and great tithes from Wales; but the emissary of Canterbury, one Buon Giovanni, a wily Lombard, had larger promises if the Pope would send a nuncio to collect aid from the English clergy. The cautious Pope, to keep both combatants in hand, appointed a commission in England to try the validity of the election, and afterwards, at the instance of Gerald, to examine the claims of St. David's—Gerald to be, meanwhile, the administrator of the diocese.'¹

Tolerably satisfied with this partial success and hopeful as to the future, Gerald returned home in the summer of 1200, and again visited St. David's, where he found a strong party in the Chapter itself now opposed to his election, which he ascribes to the threats and bribery of the archbishop. Caring little for this new spirit of opposition, Gerald now began to search the muniment-rooms at St. David's and in the various monastic houses of the diocese for documents in support of his claims, in which quest he was fairly successful. Equipped with these newly found weapons, Gerald started a second time for Rome, reaching his destination during Lent 1201. Again Innocent received the indefatigable archdeacon with condescension and favour, admitting him to his private life, and frequently conversing with him not only on the burning question of the claims of St. David's, but on a variety of subjects. Encouraged by the Pope, Gerald used sometimes to imitate the voice and manner of Archbishop Hubert, or poke fun at his bad Latin, a curious instance of the undignified mirth of the Middle Ages indulged in even by the greatest. On one occasion Innocent in jest called his new

¹ Henry Owen: *Gerald the Welshman*.

friend 'Archbishop of St. David's,' at which Gerald, frantic with delight, threw himself at the Pope's feet, exclaiming that the words of so great and wise a pontiff could not fail to be prophetic! Nor was the papal favour to end here, for he was privately informed, he tells us, of Innocent's intention of making him a cardinal, and one can imagine how greedily Gerald's inordinate vanity would swallow such a piece of gossip, and what visions of glory and power the future Welsh cardinal-archbishop would foresee in this report.

As to the actual progress of the suit itself, the whole of this second visit to Rome, lasting several months, was entirely consumed in trifling disputes between Gerald and the archbishop's representatives, Andrew and Foliot, until Innocent, weary of the petty wrangling, at last dismissed the case of each, mulcting both sides in costs, and postponing any further hearing of the claims until All Saints' Day in the following year.

Still believing himself secure of the papal favour, Gerald returned to Wales to find his cause utterly abandoned by the clergy, even the Chapter of St. David's having in the interval renounced him in favour of a new candidate of the archbishop's, the abbot of St. Dogmael's. Angered, but not discouraged, by the indifference and enmity of his own clergy, Gerald now appealed to Prince Llewellyn and to the smaller chieftains of Wales, who were certainly more favourably inclined than the priesthood. 'The laity of Wales stood by me; but of the clergy, whose battle I was fighting, scarce one,' he complains pathetically. But Prince Llewellyn, already the husband of King John's daughter, Joan, was now in close alliance with his father-in-law, while the support of the factious Welsh chieftains probably did his cause more harm than good. Fearlessly Gerald strove against all obstacles, refusing advice and disdaining the royal wrath. On his now assuming the title and dignity of a bishop, proclamations were issued by the king throughout Wales, declaring that 'Giraldus, archdeacon of Brecon, acts openly against our Crown and dignity by considering himself as bishop-elect of St. David's, though we have never assented to his election.' To this measure Gerald dauntlessly replied

by calling, in his capacity of bishop, a general council of the clergy of his diocese at Brecon; but the attempt ended in total failure owing to the refusal of the clergy through fear or indifference to attend. Gerald was now formally deprived of his benefices and even of his house at Llanduw; the abbots of the Welsh religious houses were forbidden to give him shelter; he was declared a rebel against royal authority and compelled to lie in hiding for his own safety. Even at this low ebb of his fortunes, the fugitive's wit and cheerfulness never deserted him, for hearing on one occasion at Brecon that the royal officials were on the point of seizing his manor of Llanduw, Gerald proposed to his chaplains that they should hasten thither so as to disappoint the king's bailiffs on their arrival by first drinking up or destroying all the good Welsh ale in the Llanduw cellars.

Outlawed by the king, unheeded by the Prince of Wales, and mocked by the Welsh clergy, there now was nothing left to Gerald but to make a third journey to Rome. Eluding with difficulty the royal spies who were watching for him at every seaport, he made his escape at last to the Continent, and began his journey towards Italy by way of Flanders. After suffering robbery and privation on the road, and after crossing the snow-bound Alpine passes in the depth of winter, the indomitable bishop-elect of St. David's at length reached Rome in the first week of the year 1203. This time, Innocent, in spite of his cordial welcome, was too engrossed in preparations for the Fourth Crusade and in his negotiations with the Venetians, to spare much time for the hearing of Gerald's important Welsh claims or witty tales. The poor archdeacon soon found himself at the Roman Court in the sad plight of a guest who

‘outstays his welcome while,
And tells the jest without the smile.’

He found, however, an advocate of his cause in the powerful Cardinal Octavian, bishop of Ostia, through whose influence Innocent was at last induced to give a third hearing to the complicated suit from Wales, the representatives of Canterbury being present as well as Gerald himself:

'Gerald found at Rome his enemies ready to receive him, Osbert and Foliot, John of Tynemouth and a Welsh monk, Walwyn. He plunged into the fray as if it had only just begun. Foliot produced his fresh witnesses; Gerald his letters of commendation from the Welsh princes; and fierce and bitter were the charges on both sides. The Pope annulled both elections, directed the Chapter to begin anew, and issued another commission—this time to the bishops of the province of York—to try the metropolitan claims; he also taxed Gerald's bill of costs down to sixty marks, which he ordered the archbishop to pay. Gerald took leave of the Pope, and even Innocent seemed touched at his courage and earnestness. "Doubtless, my brother," he said, "God has for His own good purpose rescued thee from this stormy life, and has reserved thee for some nobler work."¹

With all his hopes dashed to the ground by the papal decision, Gerald set his face homewards in the middle of April. Perhaps on his way back to England he reflected on the resolution formed four years before, to retire from the world and to resign himself to study; this time he had 'sacrificed too much time to ambition,' not at the English, but at the Papal Court. But further misfortunes were yet in store for the dejected archdeacon, for while journeying through France he was seized by officials of the Duke of Burgundy and cast into prison at Châtillon-sur-Saône. This act was due to the unkind offices of John of Tynemouth, one of Hubert's emissaries at Rome, who had previously advised the duke's officers to seize and imprison Gerald as a means of ingratiating themselves with King John. Gerald tells us that he was recognized by his prominent bushy eyebrows (which, according to Sir Richard Hoare, had earned him his nickname of 'Sylvester,' to which he frequently alludes in his works) and by his great stature. This incident seems to have aroused Gerald's flagging powers, for with great presence of mind he quickly concocted a story that induced the duke's warders not only to set him at liberty, but actually to arrest and imprison John of Tynemouth in his place! Hastening from Châtillon-sur-Saône, and triumphant for the moment in the discomfiture of one at least of his foes, Gerald reached Rouen, to the no small surprise and

¹ Henry Owen: *Gerald the Welshman*.

annoyance of the king, who was then in Normandy. At Rouen he vigorously protested against the pending election to St. David's and was able to induce John, who appears to have invariably treated his old tutor with a certain amount of forbearance, if not with actual kindness, to postpone the proceedings for a while. Having obtained thus much respite, Gerald crossed the Channel and paid a hasty visit to South Wales, where he found his cause completely deserted by all, so that in the whole diocese of St. David's only one old woman, he tells us, could be found who had the courage to speak openly in his favour! A new mandate had meanwhile been issued for the election, in answer to which the Chapter of St. David's had duly assembled in London. Though almost all interest in the matter must now have ceased for Gerald, since his own name was purposely excluded from the list of candidates, the archdeacon continued to protest and to put every obstacle in the way of a final election. At length, after three adjournments, the Chapter met for the last time in St. Catherine's Chapel at Westminster, where Gerald, to the surprise and delight of the sorely tried archbishop, suddenly withdrew his objections to the popular candidate, Geoffrey de Henelaw, prior of Llanthony and canon of St. David's (a peculiarly suitable choice for the see, being a Welshman, a scholar, and a churchman of blameless life), who was duly elected.

It was the approbation of defeat and despair, not of conviction; but having once made his submission after four years of fierce struggling and even unlawful defiance Gerald's withdrawal from public life was final, and with his withdrawal any existing hopes for a restoration of the old independence of the Welsh Church were definitely and for ever destroyed. Henceforth Gerald took no part in Welsh ecclesiastical affairs, to the great relief of the archbishop and to the peace of the see to which he had so long aspired. A reconciliation with the archbishop immediately took place, after which Gerald requested Hubert that he might be allowed to resign his archdeaconry of Brecon and his prebend of Mathry, the 'golden prebend' of St. David's, in favour of his nephew, Philip de Barri. To this arrangement the

archbishop agreed, and the young priest, nephew to Gerald and great-nephew to Bishop David, was at once presented with the two benefices, his uncle quoting to him the lines of Virgil :

‘Disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem,
Fortunam ex aliis.’

Though now bereft of the offices he had himself snatched from poor old Archdeacon Jordan, Gerald still kept his parishes of Angle and Tenby in Pembrokeshire and Chester-ton, near Oxford, together with a prebendal stall at Hereford ; and the income derived from these, added to an annual grant of sixty marks, enabled him to spend the last twenty years of his life in ease and comfort. To quote the words of Thierry, the French historian, Gerald now ‘devoted himself entirely to literature and obtained more celebrity as an elegant writer than as an antagonist to power,’ the remainder of his long life being occupied in writing new and revising old works, chief among the former being his wonderful autobiography, the *De Rebus a se gestis*, already alluded to. Keeping in the most determined manner out of the whirlpool of politics, both ecclesiastical and secular, this peaceful self-imposed retirement was never broken.

Two years after his reconciliation with Hubert Gerald decided to visit Rome a fourth time, not as a seeker after place and power, but as a penitent for his soul’s health, since his conscience had begun to prick him already for not a few of the overbearing acts of his youth. Innocent did his best to comfort his old friend, once so aggressive and self-confident, now so meek-spirited, insisting on his enjoyment during his lifetime of the benefices which Gerald still held but was anxious to resign as penance for his former misdeeds. On his return from Rome Gerald seems to have divided his time between South Wales and Lincoln, where he was suggested as a possible successor to St. Hugh. In the long and bitter struggle between King John and Innocent, Gerald, who was in the unique position of having been at various times in the past on terms of intimacy with both King and Pope, took no part whatever, though it was rumoured that John had tried to draw him into the fray.

Sunk in old age and literary leisure, Gerald lived long enough to see the bishopric of St. David's once more vacant at Geoffrey's death in 1214. According to one account, the see was now actually offered to its old bishop-elect and champion on the same conditions of submission and obedience to Canterbury as had been exacted from its four last bishops, only to be firmly refused on such terms. It is more probable, however, that no such offer was made, though certain members of the Chapter wished to nominate Gerald in spite of his age and retirement, and that Gerald himself was still sufficiently interested in his former ambition to feel sore at the appointment of a Welshman of pure descent, Iowerth, abbot of Talley. Nine years after this event, Gerald died at the age of seventy-six, the date of his death being fixed with tolerable certainty as the year 1223. He seems to have spent his last days in South Wales, perhaps at the family castle of Manorbier, for he was undoubtedly buried at St. David's, not far distant. Sir Richard Hoare, in his delightful sketch of Gerald, prefixed to his translation of the *Itinerarium Cambriae*, gives three full-page illustrations of his tomb and its recumbent figure, that of a fully vested priest with gentle, refined features; but much doubt has been expressed on this subject, Richard Fenton, the chief historian of Pembrokeshire, suggesting another and more elaborate tomb studded with mutilated coats-of arms as that of Gerald, while other writers deny the authenticity of either. Though his long Latin epitaphs have perished, and though his exact resting-place is doubtful, it is certain that Gerald the Welshman sleeps somewhere beneath the roof of the chief church of the see to whose interests he was so devoted during life; and to those who know and love that remote and beautiful cathedral, it is pleasant to think that it enshrines not only the ashes of St. David, patron saint of Wales, but also those of Gerald de Barri, her chief historian and one of her most patriotic, if not her most fortunate, sons.

'Noble in his birth and comely in his person; mild in his manners and affable in his conversation; zealous, active, and undaunted in maintaining the rights and dignities of his Church; moral in his character and orthodox in his principles; charitable

and disinterested, though ambitious ; learned, though superstitious : such was Giraldus. And in whatever point of view we examine the character of this extraordinary man, whether as a scholar, a patriot, or a divine, we may justly consider him as one of the brightest luminaries that adorned the annals of the twelfth century.'¹

ART. VI.—'CONTENTIO VERITATIS.'

Contentio Veritatis. Essays in Constructive Theology. By SIX OXFORD TUTORS. (London : John Murray, 1902.)

'NOTHING so quickly waxes old as apologetics, unless perhaps it be criticism.' Of this epigram we are reminded by the latest volume of theological essays, which comes to us from the University of Oxford, and which, though professedly constructive, is to a large extent occupied with the results of that critical study of the Scriptures for which is boldly claimed the dignity of the true apologetic. *Contentio Veritatis*, alike by its Latin title and by the general scope of its inquiry, inevitably challenges comparison with the now celebrated collection of essays which, under the auspices of the same publisher, was given to the world some thirteen years ago by another company of Oxford tutors. The comparison is one which, it may be, the present essayists would seek to decline. Their academic record, though sufficiently creditable, cannot compete with the almost uniformly high standard of the authors of *Lux Mundi*. Nor, with the exception of Mr. Inge, who, it is interesting to notice, is a product of the classical school at Cambridge, has any one of these writers risen to the level, we will not say of Aubrey Moore's peerless essay on the Christian Doctrine of God, but of Mr. Illingworth on the Incarnation, or Dr. Lock on the Church. We miss the firm tread of conviction, the broad philosophic grasp, the ringing voice of a whole-hearted enthusiasm which distinguished the earlier essays. The absence of subtle humour, a salt which few subjects are too serious not to require, makes

¹ Sir R. C. Hoare's *Life of Giraldus*.

the book very dull in parts. And we confess to a suspicion that the disposition to hang up questions and to speak uncertainly is due, not entirely to the proper hesitation of the constructive theologian, but, in part at least, to an imperfect realization of the issues. Nor must we omit to notice a certain vein of self-consciousness, the besetting sin of idealists, which invests what 'some of us' think, to adopt a favourite phrase of Dr. Rashdall, with an exaggerated importance, and elevates into necessary truth a transitory phase of philosophic thought. But even if we are unable to say that, apart from Mr. Inge's admirable treatment of the Sacraments, and though in a lesser degree of his essay on the Person of Christ, the volume before us has advanced to any great extent the solution of present problems, we are yet prepared to extend a sympathetic, if discriminating, welcome to a series of essays with the intention of which we are in general agreement, and whose tentative character the authors themselves would be the first to acknowledge.

The two words which have been adopted as the title of the book sufficiently reveal the spirit and attitude of the writers. Though the standpoint of each may in some respects vary, they all desire to be regarded as 'lovers of truth,' who have learned the lesson of past failures, and recognize that what have been mistaken for the interests of faith have often been fatal, if not to a genuine honesty, at least to an unclouded vision. With them we unreservedly rejoice that 'the acrimonious dispute between Natural Science and the old Orthodoxy, which agitated the last generation, is happily a thing of the past.' And, if somewhat more inclined to look with disfavour upon the ill-considered vagaries not infrequently pressed upon our notice in the name of historical science by men whose psychological idiosyncrasies seem to be the measure of their critical judgment, we have accepted with equal readiness the method of criticism, and 'are prepared to apply it with some boldness' not only to the Old Testament, but also to the New. We at any rate will not invoke authority to crush or stifle inquiry. But we observe that our essayists have themselves imposed a limitation upon speculation, which must not be forgotten in estimating the

positions which they appear to occupy. 'They are agreed,' so they tell us, 'that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ."' It is true that this assertion needs interpretation, and that as it stands it might be accepted by writers representing opposite poles of theological thought. But the preface claims on behalf of all the contributors that they write 'as Christians and Churchmen, no less than as lovers of truth.' Entering upon a 'contentio veritatis,' they would wish also to 'contend earnestly for the faith once delivered.' Indeed this is the ground of the repeated assurance, which meets us in more than one of the essays, that the most serviceable apologist is he who comes in the thin disguise of the critic. The work of the liberal theologian is declared to be 'repairing the breaches,' rather than constructing a new body of divinity. While, therefore, we recognize the grave responsibility resting upon all teachers 'who lay on the necks of the disciples any burden beyond "the necessary things,"' we would venture to remind the editor that the conciliar letter to which he refers speaks of 'these necessary things,' and that one who writes not only as a Churchman, but as an accredited teacher of theology, must in some sense be regarded as delivering judgment *ex cathedra*.

A full acceptance of the critical method, or even of such results as are provisionally established, may accompany an uncompromising refusal of the conclusions—or ought we not rather to say the hesitations?—of some of the essays. There are many persons of competent knowledge and sober judgment who would see no cause for complaint in Mr. Burney's statement of the permanent religious value of the Old Testament, and yet find Dr. Rashdall's basis of theism almost as insecure a bottom as Plato's raft. But the experience of *Essays and Reviews* has taught us that papers bound up in one volume, unless each writer is careful to explain how far, and how far alone, he agrees with those who have collaborated with him, will inevitably be taken as contributing to one general result. In speaking, therefore, of *Contentio Veritatis* as a whole, we do not think we can be rightly blamed if we should appear to attribute to any one of the six tutors a

theological standpoint which, it may be, is only his by association.

No subject makes greater demands upon an extended observation of the world and a sympathetic knowledge of men than religion. Theology lies so close to life, the subject with which it deals exhibits so intimate a correspondence with the fundamental needs of human nature, that learning, however profound, and penetration, however acute, are not in themselves sufficient to impart that clearness of vision which accurately interprets the facts with which the divine is called upon to deal. The writers of *Lux Mundi* were almost wholly occupied with academic pursuits, but no feature was more conspicuous in their thought and life than a strong and vivid interest in the great social problems which began to agitate men's minds some twenty years ago. It was this broad humanity which led them to establish the Oxford House in Bethnal Green, to inaugurate the Christian Social Union, to foster the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. They brought the intellectual interest of the university, on its religious no less than on its secular side, into close and vital contact with the realities of life, the needs and aspirations of the common people, and they realized not only the intellectual difficulties of the earnest student, but the religious needs of the human heart. But it is almost in vain that we search for any adequate realization of the man in the street, any due appreciation of Christ's message to the millions, any strong conviction of the connexion between Church and people, in the work now before us. A few words here and there about brotherhood, a few general statements concerning the Kingdom of God practically exhaust the evidence of any such sentiment. Of the serious results that flow from this manifest deficiency we shall have to speak presently.

But a defective social sympathy is not the only witness to a limited experience which this book presents. Whether the clergy of England 'have an adequate appreciation of the changes which' an acceptance of critical results 'necessarily involves' as regards 'the whole tone and temper of theology,' depends on what is allowed to be adequate. Of one thing we are certain. Nothing but a very inadequate acquaintance

with the men who have been ordained within the last twenty years could have evolved the statement that 'the bare acceptance of the critical attitude towards the Bible has as yet very imperfectly permeated the bulk of the clergy.' Men of an older generation may, perhaps, be expected to remain where they were, and it is not to them that *Contentio Veritatis* is addressed. Nor, remembering that even in Oxford itself such differences exist as those which separate, let us say, Dr. Cheyne from Mr. Sayce, Mr. Margoliouth from Dr. Driver, can we reasonably cavil if younger men throughout the country are found to ascribe Deuteronomy to Moses or Psalm cx. to David. But that the essay either of Mr. Burney or Mr. Allen will come as a surprise to the junior clergy we can with absolute confidence deny. It is twenty-two years since the present Bishop of Worcester was appointed vice-principal of Cuddesdon. One of his successors was Mr. Ottley. The name of Dr. Gibson, associated for sixteen years with the college at Wells, is in itself a sufficient guarantee of a fearless though cautious acceptance of modern methods. And those who have read the late George Fowler's paper on the New Theology, or his notes on Old Testament Difficulties,¹ would smile at the bare suggestion that students were sent out from Leeds with an imperfect appreciation of Biblical criticism. We speak of these three colleges, not as exceptions to a general rule, but rather as notable instances of a tone and temper in theological education common to most theological colleges. Bishops have for many years set questions on the authorship of the Psalms or the origin of the Pentateuch in their examinations for deacons' orders. The Synoptic problem, the Two Document theory are commonplaces of the lecture-room. Questions raised by criticism are discussed in clerical societies with an open-minded freedom not excelled in the universities. Our theological colleges are the best guarantee that the Church neither is, nor is likely to be, in danger of a timid, obscurantist, or reactionary clergy. In fact, we are not certain it would

¹ Published in *Things Old and New*, sermons and papers by the Rev. G. H. Fowler, late Principal of Leeds Clergy School. London, 1892.

not be true to say that many of the parochial clergy have thought over critical questions more deeply than the Essayists. The Essayists appear to us hardly to have got beyond the stage of ten or fifteen years ago. The difficulties they meet are the difficulties felt then, but many of the parochial clergy and those engaged in practical work are asking for an answer to a deeper and more difficult question, 'What is the "authority" of the Bible?'

But a tendency to misrepresent the position of the clergy in the matter of criticism is a venial error in comparison with what we believe to be the main failure of the book. If there is one atmosphere more unfavourable than another to the theological student it is perhaps that of our modern universities. The pedantry of the academic life is checked only by a social system in the highest degree artificial, and an experience far removed from the unsophisticated workaday world. Even the humbler classes have acquired a veneer of subservience which conceals the real manhood. Nor can it be said that undergraduate life tends to develop the deeper religious needs. The novel freedom of college rooms, the absence of any responsibility more serious than the schools, athletic and social distractions, the keen delight of newly discovered intellectual interests, all tend to deaden the sense of spiritual hunger. Sin is a veiled deformity and death a far-off dream. If, therefore, the demand, or what seems to be the demand, of the undergraduate, be taken as the type of human need, we may predict that the religious teacher, whose interpretation of the Christian faith is limited by the desire to satisfy it, will present us with a picture which falls far short of an adequate representation of Him who was uplifted that He might draw all men unto Himself. And it is here that in our judgment the writers of *Contentio Veritatis* have conspicuously failed.

Mr. Wild's assertion that, if the teaching of Christ had followed the lines of the current Pharisaism, its motto might well have been 'How hardly shall they that have not riches enter into the kingdom of God,' is an admission of the fact that a theology which cannot translate itself into the language of the common people fails to express that religion

19
wh
of
he
tha
Th
in
the
Th
Chr
mar
me
is n
as a
hoo
to p
final
pers
The
finis
revel
dispe
V
stand
be m
essay
M
renew
featur
exclus
tion t
the ol
phrase
the wa
to such
His m
end.
reveli
a suffici
presum
VOL.

which above all else is a gospel for the poor. It is the need of the simple which expresses the ultimate yearning of the heart of man. What, then, do the people need? What is it that has satisfied them in the good news of Jesus Christ? The answer is plain. They need salvation from sin and hope in death. And the proclamation which has brought joy to the weary and light to the dying bed is Christ crucified. This message has never meant only, or even primarily, that Christ, who in the course of His self-manifestation incurred a martyr's death, revealed the forgiving love of the Father. It means that the Death on Calvary, in which the Resurrection is necessarily included alike as the pledge and crown, availed as an objective fact to win forgiveness, and that the manhood which Christ brought again from the dead is prevalent to plead for the reconciliation, to purify the consciences, and finally to quicken the mortal bodies of sinful men. Not the person but the work of Christ is the kernel of Christianity. The Cross was a victory. Something was there accomplished, finished, done. Christianity is not only a revelation. The revelation is itself secondary to what Butler has called 'a dispensation of redemption.'

We have, then, in this conception of Christianity the standard by which all theological teaching must ultimately be measured. We have to ask what is the attitude of these essays towards Christ as the Redeemer.

Mr. Wild's subject is the Teaching of Christ. With the renewed study of our Lord's ministry, which is a marked feature of our age, we have no quarrel. To view our Saviour exclusively as the official Mediator is in the interests of salvation to deprive the Incarnation of its actuality. The fault of the older Evangelicalism was the undue prominence of such phrases as the plan of redemption, the scheme of the gospel, the way of salvation. And we freely acknowledge our debt to such teachers as Ritschl, who have insisted that in fulfilling His mission for mankind Jesus Christ pursued His own moral end. But when Mr. Wild conceives the Lord's teaching as revealing His person and nothing more; when he gives us as a sufficient account of the mighty works among which, we presume, must be found a place for the Resurrection, that they

are signs of His personality, and may therefore be regarded as Christ's teaching by act; all we can say is that he leaves off at the very point where in the judgment of the Christian centuries the redeeming work begins. That 'the living Christ is more than any [ethical] system' is a profound truth, and that Mr. Wild and other modern students of the Galilean ministry, especially in Germany, should be led to this conclusion marks a distinct advance in the appreciation of the Synoptic narrative. But it is not what Christ said, nor even what He was, but rather what He did in the power of what He was, that is the fundamental fact of Christianity. This is where Mr. Wild's presentation ceases to ring true. Interpreting the saying of Jesus reported by the Fourth Gospel concerning His voluntary surrender of life, in obedience to the Father's commandment, Mr. Wild thinks it sufficient to say that this was a commandment 'to be faithful to this loving duty of revelation.' Will the experience of Christendom assent to the proposition that the death of Christ was only, or even mainly, a revelation? Yet Mr. Wild goes on to make it evident that to him it is no more. 'Death,' he declares, 'as the utmost sacrifice was to crown the life, vanquishing the prince of this world and of selfishness, and once for all exalting love and devotion to duty as the only standard of conduct.' The exaltation of love and devotion to duty! Is this all that is contained in the uplifting from the earth of the Son of Man? Is it only an exhibition that is to draw all men to Him? 'The death,' we are told, 'became the revelation of a new standard,' and thus 'Jesus' supreme consecration of His life was to lead to similar consecration in His disciples.' It is true that this view of redemption by revelation is subsequently modified by what is added concerning the coming of the Spirit. But at best this gift of an abiding Presence is only a mystical illumination, not the inevitable consequence of an efficacious sacrifice, the communication of the risen life. Its relation to the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, which has been prominent in Christian theology from the days of the Apostles, is entirely ignored. All that Mr. Wild can say is that 'the death perfecting the sacrifice of the life would be the seal of His eternal union with the Father, and so the

is
C
S
e
th
co
C
te
er
m
be
se
an
Ag
be
of
res
but
wo
wri
rec
con
earl
to
non
Eig
cert
give
the
right
theo
the
carri
ful m
say
of Je
His
And
us to
forwa

coming of the Spirit of God would be the coming of His Spirit.' Is that, we ask, a sufficient account of the Spirit, even as we find it in the Fourth Gospel? Mr. Wild is aware that in presenting this view of the death of Christ and its consequences he has to reckon with the whole trend of Christian theology. 'The mistake,' he asserts with some temerity, 'of subsequent writers has lain in placing the emphasis too exclusively upon the death of Jesus as the means of redemption.' We reply that, if the Cross has become the exclusive symbol of the Christian religion; if the sentiment of one age has centered round the crucifix and of another has found expression in such hymns as 'Rock of Ages'; if dying eyes have been fixed, not upon the scenes of the beneficent Galilean ministry, but upon the victorious tragedy of Golgotha; if departing souls have passed into the unseen resting not upon some general revelation of Divine fatherhood but upon the finished work and meritorious Passion of the world's Redeemer; this is no late discovery of 'subsequent writers,' but simply the message of the facts as they are recorded in the New Testament. Even on the showing of conservative critics the Gospel of St. John cannot be dated earlier than the close of the first century. But what are we to make of that proclamation of the Resurrection which, as none denies, was the substance of the Apostolic preaching? Eighteen centuries separate St. Peter from Paley. It was certainly not as a proof of revelation that prominence was given to that stupendous event. 'They proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection of the dead': 'Him did God exalt with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour.' It was not a theology, whether attested by miracles or not, that formed the subject of the Pentecostal preaching, but a deed which carried with it tremendous consequences, a fact which to sinful men meant forgiveness, restoration, life. Or what shall we say of the Pauline epistles, whose theme is not the teaching of Jesus, but our reconciliation to God through the death of His Son and our salvation by His risen and glorified life? And what of the Synoptic narrative itself? It would carry us too far afield to discuss the view which Mr. Wild puts forward of the works of Jesus; they were something more

than signs; they were redemptive acts. But why have we no recognition of a fact, which is certainly remarkable, that even in St. Mark the story of the Passion is out of all proportion to the rest of the Gospel, and that in this matter at least the Fourth Gospel presents the same phenomenon as the Synoptists? This, and much else, demands full treatment and explanation before we can allow that Mr. Wild is not altering the focus of the Christian revelation.

We pass to the essay on the Person of Christ. The author of the Bampton Lectures on *Christian Mysticism* would lend distinction to any undertaking with which his name was associated. It is impossible not to recognize that in Mr. Inge we are dealing with a theologian from whom we should naturally hesitate to differ. His views of truth are always given with a beauty and reverence of expression which are only less conspicuous features of his work than the authority of sound learning and careful thought that is everywhere apparent. The criticism which we have to make must not, therefore, be understood as directed against the whole essay, but as emphasizing one defect which, however serious, still leaves us in cordial agreement with by far the greater part of what he has written. Mr. Inge realizes most fully that the abiding presence and perpetual intercession of the living Christ, and not the beneficent example of His earthly ministry, represent the true worth of Him who 'is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever.' But past forgetfulness of the eternal Priesthood has caused not a few of us to obscure in the revival of neglected truth that aspect of the Atonement which was vividly present to the mind of a former generation and to miss the centrality of Calvary. Mr. Inge has what we may call a regulative theological idea. Just as Ritschl uses the Kingdom of God, evacuating sin and redemption of more than half their meaning in order to bring them within the compass of this conception, so does Mr. Inge handle the *unio mystica*, or communion of mankind with God in Christ. It is this doctrine which governs his whole theology, enabling him to give due effect, on the one hand, to the Catholic definition of the Person of Christ as the Incarnate Word, and on the other to the sacramental mysteries, while at

the same time preventing him from recognizing the historical Atonement as the true justification alike of the Logos doctrine and the sacramental system. What differentiates the Nicene formula from the heretical confessions is, not that the former exhibits a more accurate use of metaphysical language than the latter, but that the Catholic Creed is consistent with the historical facts of the primitive apostolic preaching, while the language of Arius or Eutyches is not. It is not inconceivable that the terms employed by the Athanasian theology are unsuitable, as they certainly are inadequate, to express a mystery which is 'more true than plain.' We have no fault to find with the Ritschlians for venturing to question the terminology of the fourth century as involving a discredited metaphysic and an imperfect psychology. We do not think that they have proved, or are likely to prove their case, but, inasmuch as even General Councils have erred, there is no preliminary objection to the discussion. But once deny the Resurrection, or even consent to regard its occurrence as an open question, and immediately the most orthodox creed becomes little better than a hidden Gnosticism. How were the Apostles at Pentecost able, to deliver a Gospel recognized as substantially identical with that proclaimed from our pulpits to-day? Why was it not till after he had elaborated his teaching on justification through faith in a crucified and risen Saviour that St. Paul developed, as in Colossians and Ephesians, that Christology which together with the Prologue of St. John became the basis of the Athanasian doctrine? The answer is that Christian Theology is the systematic explanation, not primarily either of Christ's Teaching or of the Impression of His Personality, but of those facts of the historic work of Redemption which are summed up in the Resurrection. In the fifth century the West succeeded to the East as the evangelizer of the world, because its strong practical spirit revived in the Augustinian theology the earlier epistles of St. Paul. The East, forgetful of the due proportions of the Athanasian teaching, became engrossed in discussions concerning the Person of Christ, which, if not barren logomachies, yet threw into the background the purpose for which Christ came, lost

touch with the actual needs of the multitude, and quenched the missionary flame. There is, of course, a wisdom 'among them that are perfect'; who, like the dying Hooker, can contemplate 'the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order.' But even the theology of the Incarnate Word only ceases to be a speculative philosophy when it is held in due subordination to that 'foolishness of preaching' which is the gospel of 'the wayfaring men.' It is, then, by its fidelity to the historical Atonement that Mr. Inge's doctrine of the Person of Christ must be judged.

Mr. Inge's position with reference to traditional Evangelicalism is evident from his criticism of the post-Reformation Lutherans. Their 'sharp dualism of nature and grace, with the allied doctrine of imputed righteousness, made a scientific Christology as impossible as in the unreformed Church.' In other words, a theology which does not resolve the reconciliation of man with God into the mystical union offends Mr. Inge's idealism and conflicts with his regulative idea. 'We must assert,' he says in discussing the interchange of attributes between the Divine and human natures, 'that God and man are even now reconciled.' Such a statement as this, though it will doubtless commend itself to many minds, seems to obscure the distinction between the Incarnation and the Atonement, but it would appear to be the teaching of the New Testament that the former was the means and the latter the end. 'To this end was the Son of God manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil.' Mr. Inge has himself said with perfect truth that to the Hebrew mind incarnation was not in itself an act of humiliation. And St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians represents the Lord as having received 'the Name which is above every name,' not as is sometimes erroneously supposed because He became man, but because 'being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself' in 'becoming obedient unto death,' and that no ordinary surrender of life, but the only sacrifice which, in fact, possessed objective merit and vital efficacy, 'yea, the death of the cross.' Mr. Inge's use of the word 'atone' is inconsistent alike with ordinary usage and Scriptural analogy. If a word is wanted to render *καταλ-*

19
λ
us
Th
sic
ser
in
the
pro
ap
no
my
clo
ma
off
is a
act
dis
att
us
be
up
the
mo
the
eve
inte
nar
the
litt
reg

1
curr
Else
'wh
Thu
unio
nent
cilia
Test
King

λάσσειν, we must say 'reconcile,' and not adopt a transitive use of 'atone.' But Mr. Inge speaks of atoning God and man. This is an instance, not unparalleled in theological discussion,¹ of forcing the etymology of a word in order to yield a sense which as a matter of fact it does not bear. Atonement in Scripture means an act of propitiation whereby God and the sinner are reconciled, which 'abolishes the enmity' by the provision of a sacrifice for sin. This is a mystery which has appealed with power to the conscience of millions, and nothing is gained by the attempt to resolve it into another mystery, for which, it may be, the mind of an idealist has closer affinity. Mr. Inge is acute enough to see that he is maintaining a paradox for which some explanation must be offered. He allows that 'the normal *form* of religious faith is an event, or series of events, which is conceived as having actually taken place.' But his philosophy enables him to discount the value of the Gospel facts by a theory, the attractiveness of which to the Catholic temper must not blind us to its real significance. 'At most,' he says, 'they can only be *efficacia signa*.' But to say that the Sacraments are based upon the principle of the Incarnation is one thing; to reverse the process and resolve the facts of Redemption into nothing more than Sacraments is quite another. In the former case the sign is interpreted by the thing signified; in the latter, even if the analogy holds, the thing signified can only be interpreted by the sign. And, if the facts of the Gospel narrative may rightly be called efficacious signs, not only are they removed from the category of ordinary history, but it is little wonder if the occurrence of some at least of them is regarded as an open question. Before we can acquiesce in

¹ Compare the not uncommon treatment of 'justify' or 'eternal' in current theology. These strictures are not academic or hypercritical. Elsewhere Mr. Inge speaks of the true idea of sacrifice being realized 'when priest and victim, God and worshippers, are *atoned* or united.' Thus he contracts the idea of atonement into the narrow meaning of union. Reconciliation is, in the Old Testament, and still more prominently in the New, the leading thought. Union is the state of reconciliation. See Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. ii. c. 6: 'The Old Testament Doctrine of Atonement'; W. L. Walker, *The Cross and the Kingdom*, Pt. iii. c. 1: 'In the Light of the Old Testament.'

this view, we must have travelled far from the position of St. Paul, when he declares that if Christ hath not been raised, we are yet in our sins.

But Mr. Inge's unfortunate prejudice leads him into a still further error. He fails to account for the facts of sacrifice which the science of comparative religion submits for our observation. The essay on Sacraments marks a real point of departure in the study of Eucharistic doctrine, because it substitutes the historical for the metaphysical treatment with a thoroughness that we do not remember to have seen equalled, certainly not excelled, by any previous writer. But even here the bugbear of his regulative idea pursues him. He dismisses the doctrine of substitution as follows :

'The doctrine of substitution (vicarious punishment) is unethical, though that of vicarious suffering is not. Jesus Christ was able by His death to atone God and man because He was God as well as man. No other bloodshedding could take away sin. Bloody sacrifices, therefore, and the doctrine of substitution were abolished.'

Does Mr. Inge mean that the doctrine of substitution was abolished as the correlative of bloody sacrifice? In the same breath he says, in strict conformity with Scripture and the Christian conscience, that bloody sacrifice was abolished because 'no *other* bloodshedding' than that of Christ 'could take away sin.' But surely the doctrine of substitution is not rightly described as unethical. In the concrete experience of life the connexion between morality and religion is so intimate that a divorce between the two orders of ideas is impossible, while the attempt to sever them is in the highest degree dangerous to both. A religious rite, for example, must be either moral or immoral. But in the abstract—that is, when we are pursuing a scientific investigation—we do not rightly represent the phenomena unless we regard a religious fact as different from an ethical one. The need which impels man to righteousness is not the same as that which leads him to worship. Whether it is accurate to identify 'substitution' with vicarious punishment depends upon the connotation of the term. We should prefer to say 'vicarious guilt.' And we venture to affirm that it is precisely vicarious

guilt which is involved both in Hebrew and ethnic rites of propitiation. It is only the rationalist who will seek to resolve the mysteries of Christianity into ethical constituents. It is with mysteries that religion deals, and a mystery, whether heathen or Christian, is the revelation of a truth otherwise undiscoverable. The distinguishing characteristic of the Christian mysteries is not that they are identified with, but that they necessarily issue in the noblest morality. In the surrendered will of Christ we are not only pardoned, but sanctified through the offering of His Body once for all. We hold, then, that Mr. Inge, no less than Mr. Wild, has failed to grasp the true proportions of the Faith of Christ, and that the most serious defect of *Contentio Veritatis* is neither its attitude towards the Christian miracles, nor its doubtful philosophic basis, but a theology which fails to correspond either to an adequate exegesis of Holy Scripture or to the deepest needs of mankind.

When once the centre of gravity has been shifted, it does not surprise us that these writers should adopt an attitude of doubt and hesitation towards those events of our Lord's earthly life which it is usual to call His miracles. Only two of the essayists refrain altogether from discussing the question, and, their subjects being respectively the Old Testament and the Church, the topic was scarcely relevant. Even Mr. Allen so handles the Matthaean narrative of the Infancy, as at least to suggest that he is preparing the way for a possible rejection of the Virgin Birth. Dr. Rashdall, of whose introductory essay on the Ultimate Basis of Theism we shall have to speak presently, while admitting that a rejection of 'miraculous' events does not necessarily follow from his philosophy, is nevertheless so far convinced that 'to admit in practice the possibility of such an event is to destroy the canons upon which not only our ordinary reasoning about matters of science, but in particular our ordinary canons of historical criticism, are based,' that he is evidently prepared to substitute for a physical Resurrection of our Lord 'visions of Himself which were not mere subjective delusions,' agreeing in this respect, so far as we can collect the sense of either writer, with Harnack. Mr. Inge holding that there is 'no

agreement whether miracles are to be expected or desired as part of a revelation,' would evidently, though far more cautious in statement than Dr. Rashdall, desire to make, not the Resurrection, but 'the identification of the man Christ Jesus with the Word of God,' the rallying ground for Christians. The consideration that 'the laws of nature appear to be uniform' has no less weight with him than with the author of the preceding essay. The same may be said of Mr. Wild. 'The spread of the area of scientific uniformity' inclines him to say that 'our present historical records, even on the most favourable view, do not give us' adequate assurance of the occurrence of 'supposed exceptions' to general laws. Admitting that 'the element of miracle in the records remains an important structural feature,' he yet thinks the exercise of will in acts of healing was 'possibly the foundation of all the stories in a wondering age.' Those for whom 'the power of spiritual personality, gathering force like some great tidal wave, sweeps up over all material laws of evidence'—a picturesque formula which apparently covers all who would adopt a more uncompromising attitude—are bidden in language that at least suggests that they may themselves be the weaker brethren, 'to bear with those who stumble where they firmly tread.'

Now the question which these essayists have raised, with a uniformity almost equal to that of nature itself is not exhausted, as they must themselves know perfectly well, by an appeal for considerate dealing. All sincere Christians will be ready to bear gently even with those to whom the Divine Personality of our Lord, which is Mr. Inge's *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, appears an impossible conception. The question is whether the Faith of the Church is henceforth to include the physical Resurrection of our Lord. That a Christianity without the Resurrection, without, that is, anything beyond an assurance of the Lord's continued existence effected by means of objective visions, would be an entirely new departure in the development of our religion, admits of no reasonable doubt. Not that such proposals are unprecedented. There is nothing strikingly original even in what seems to be the plan before us, a non-miraculous but otherwise

orthodox theology. But such schemes have hitherto been produced only to be dismissed, and traditional Christianity has rested from the beginning, and still rests, upon the Resurrection. If, therefore, these writers had desired to shift the basis of faith, or, as they would doubtless prefer to put it, to show that, appearances notwithstanding, miracles never were that basis, one essay at the least should have been entirely devoted to this subject alone. The process of disentanglement could not be otherwise than dangerous, and we hold that the editor has failed to realize the responsibility of his position in confining the treatment of a question of such serious importance to tentative, though repeated, suggestion.

But, if these discussions strike us as singularly inadequate, we are no less astonished at the remarkable crudities which at every turn they exhibit. Did these essayists, we are almost tempted to ask, fall asleep in the eighteenth century, and awaken, like Rip Van Winkle, upon a world which had been moving on for more than a hundred years of constant and rapid progress? Listen to Mr. Inge. After deprecating the contempt cast upon the 'Old Bailey theology of Paley and his school,' he goes on to 'impress upon' his readers, 'with all the earnestness' he can, 'that it is a false method, and that those who rely upon it are trusting to a broken reed.' 'The majority of Christians to-day,' he continues, 'do not really lean upon it, whatever they may think; they are Christians because they have found Christ, or rather because Christ has found them, not because they have given the Apostles a fair trial on a charge of perjury and acquitted them.' Mr. Inge cannot imagine that he is articulating the unexpressed convictions of the majority of modern Christians and correcting a belated apologetic. He cannot surely believe that the system he naively rejects expresses the universal view of past ages, and that Alexandrian doctors and primitive Fathers, not to speak of Apostles themselves, wore the wig and gown of the Georgian archdeacon. Paley does not represent even the apology of his own age. Pascal was contemporary, though not with Paley, yet with the earlier Deists, such as Lord Herbert and Toland. 'If I had seen a miracle, say some, I should be converted: they would not speak

thus, if they knew what conversion meant.' That sentence from the *Pensées* exhibits a mode of thought far enough removed from reliance upon the verdict of 'twelve good men and true.' Nor does Butler regard the evidence for revealed religion as capable of convincing a common jury of his fellow-countrymen. 'Levity, carelessness, passion and prejudice,' he urges, 'do hinder us from being rightly informed with respect to common things; and they may, in like manner, and *perhaps in some further providential manner*, with respect to moral and religious subjects.' But we are not living in the eighteenth century. We venture to affirm that no theologian of repute would in these days accept Hume's definition of a miracle as 'a violation of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity.' The reason is simply that a miracle so defined 'is relative,' as Butler has it, 'to a course of nature,' a conception which has irrevocably passed. The modern view of the world involves the disappearance not of the so-called miracles themselves, but of an imperfect theory of their occurrence. The phrases persistently used in the volume before us show that miracles are to these writers what they were to the English apologists of the eighteenth century—that is to say, interferences with the order of nature. True, it may only be the observed order. But 'violation of the uniformity of nature,' 'interference with the ordinary course of events,' 'special intervention of the Divine will contrary to the natural order of things,' 'supposed exceptions to general laws'—these expressions are characteristic of an attitude at variance with the highest religious thought of modern times. Dr. Rashdall appears to imagine that, though we must cease to *demand* physical miracles, yet faith 'may be reasonably strengthened' by them, 'if the historical testimony is sufficient.' It is extraordinary that a responsible writer should so misconceive the situation as to suppose that the demand for miracles as such exists, or that, if the physical Resurrection ceased to be regarded as the basis of the Risen Life, an assurance of its occurrence would add one scrap of confirmation to the testimony in favour of the Divinity of our Lord. The demand is not for miracles but for facts.

To anyone who has the smallest acquaintance with

modern apologetics, there is something almost ludicrous in Dr. Rashdall's instance of the saint's finger chopped off by a machine. And when Mr. Inge declares that in these days we should not *a priori* expect the Incarnate Logos to 'resuscitate His earthly body and remove it into the sky,' he enters upon a field of speculation entirely barren of results. How can any man say what his expectations would be, if the whole of his experience in regard to religion were blotted out? The only safe method in the matter of the Christian facts is as strictly *a posteriori* as in matters of scientific or historical investigation. 'Modern agnosticism,' says George Romanes, 'is performing this great service to Christian faith; it is silencing all rational scepticism of the *a priori* kind.' If instead of founding their theology upon idealism, the writers of these essays had been content to approach the subject from the point of view which Mr. Romanes has happily termed pure agnosticism, they would have realized that the Uniformity of Nature is no more necessary to science than to ordinary experience, and that what is peculiarly scientific is not the expectation of recurrence, but simply the methodical observation of facts. The accuracy of scientific observation varies almost inversely with the importance of the subject. This is because the more abstract a subject is, the less nearly it touches us. Men are far more likely to differ about the Boer War or the Education Act than about matters of chemistry or physics, and in the former case, at least, arguments from *a priori* presumption have had disastrous results. Shall we quarrel, then, either with Butler's assertion that in a matter so remote from ordinary experience as the deepest mysteries of faith mankind are incompetent judges, or with his confident acquiescence in the variety of their attitude towards the Resurrection considered as a fact of history? The Ritschlians have invented a phrase which differentiates the 'value-judgments' of religion from the 'theoretical-judgments' of science. If this distinction were intended to imply that the fact of God's existence or Christ's Resurrection is intrinsically different in kind from the facts of ordinary experience, because 'with the heart man believeth,' and not with a bare intellectual apprehension, we should deny its

validity. But if it means that there is no range of facts with regard to which the evidence is more dependent upon 'psychological climate,' and that to the man in all whose thoughts God is not it must ever remain a thing incredible that God should raise the dead, then they are only saying what Butler and Mozley, Dr. Milligan and Mr. Arthur Balfour, Aubrey Moore and George Romanes would not only freely allow, but emphatically urge. That Nature is one we have long since learned to believe, and that there is no intrinsic opposition between one set of facts and another, we shall all gladly allow. In that sense we all believe that miracles do not 'happen.' But those whose whole character and life are based on the Resurrection; who realize that Christianity is not a Divine revelation attested by miracles, but 'a dispensation of redemption' indivisible and 'woven from the top throughout'; and who in the history of the Christian centuries have witnessed the objective verification which the fruits of the Easter faith have given to the Easter message, will recognize in the fact that 'on the third day He rose again from the dead' an event which, though necessarily unique, is as rational as their own personal actions, and no less the cement of all their experience than the consummation of all their hopes.

We have referred incidentally to the philosophical basis upon which apparently the reconstructed theology, towards which *Contentio Veritatis* is a contribution, is intended to be reared. So satisfied does Dr. Rashdall appear with the security of these foundations that he is comparatively indifferent to the rest. Though in some respects an ally of the Ritschlian school, he entrenches himself in metaphysics. In Dr. Rashdall more than any other of the essayists, we miss that width of concrete experience which, next to a knowledge of the Scriptures, is the best equipment of the theologian. It is the young student of philosophy, revelling in the dialectical discussion of subject and object, keener on what he takes for the necessities of thought than on what, whether he knows it or not, are the necessities of life—it is this young man in his passage through the measles of a philosophical education that Dr. Rashdall has constantly in

mind. That the Oxford tutor has a special responsibility to the pupils entrusted to his care is not disputed. Only he must beware lest it be a religion which to the Greeks shall not be foolishness the basis of which he desires to lay. Has the essay before us fully escaped from this defect? The writer begins from a fully developed stage in speculative philosophy, when not only all that is mythical but all that is personal has been refined away: from Plato rather than from Thales. The stages in which he builds his speculative theism are three in number. By an argument familiar to all students as that of Berkeley and the psychological idealists, he establishes the existence of that curious abstraction called Mind as that for which all material things exist. Having secured Mind, he proceeds to invest it with Will by an analysis of causation, revealing Purpose no less than Antecedence as necessary to the conception. A Kantian consideration of the Human Conscience shows this Purposeful Mind as directed towards Goodness and Love. Thus, according to Dr. Rashdall, we have our belief in the Being of God established on an irrefragable basis of metaphysic. And how is this to be reconciled with theology? Nothing is easier. Scriptural exegesis, higher criticism, miraculous facts need not trouble us. Towards all such difficulties we may adopt the most liberal and complacent attitude. It is only necessary to consult Aquinas and see what the thirteenth century thought about the Trinity. 'God,' said St. Thomas, 'is essentially Power, Wisdom, and Will.' Now, of course, Wisdom means Mind; Power, Will, or Purpose; and Will, Goodwill or Love. *Ergo*, St. Thomas agrees with Dr. Rashdall. The voice of Philosophy and Theology is one.

Dr. Rashdall has constructed an argument so simple in its unsophisticated idealism, so dogmatic in its confident assertion, as almost to suggest that even its author may perhaps doubt whether it is not more plain than true. Realists will grant readily enough that pre-Kantian idealism is as good as any other for the purpose in hand, and that it is all one whether the argument be that of Berkeley or Hegel, Professor Wundt or Dr. Edward Caird. To such thinkers the step from the perceiving and reasoning

intelligence of the individual to the Universal Mind has always seemed impossible. They are not necessarily materialists. 'The real world,' says Mr. Case, 'includes, between the sensible and the supernatural, the natural world of insensible bodies and imperceptible corpuscles, which are physical objects of scientific knowledge inferrible only from physical data of human sense.' And if no philosophy has a monopoly, there is an air of arrogance in the suggestion that systematic idealism affords the only rational basis for theology, and is what 'the theistic argument comes to when it is fully thought out.' 'Some who may not be prepared,' says Dr. Rashdall, 'to accept the particular line of argument which will be here offered in its full extent, may nevertheless be able to accept it sufficiently to acquiesce in the religious or theological part of my conclusion.' Men who think that they see reasons for rejecting idealism at least as valid as those which persuaded Dr. Rashdall to accept it, will answer that they can no more adopt its principles for theological purposes than hold to the doctrine of Transubstantiation while refusing the scholastic system. We claim, then, on behalf of that large body of serious thinkers who are not idealists, not that this type of thought should be banished from the realm of religious philosophy, but that it should be retained rather as the setting in which some thinkers find the Christian facts most intelligible than as the system upon which the theological structure must inevitably be built. That there is a place for the 'Christian Gnostic,' that Faith must express itself in terms of Thought, no one with the Fourth Gospel before him would dream of denying. But it is worth while to point out that the experience, of which that Gospel is the record, begins with the concrete realization of the Galilean Prophet as the sin-bearing Lamb of God, and that the philosophic statement of faith is only secured from the grave danger of syncretism when the historical method has first been duly followed. The work which Dr. Rashdall has attempted needs to be done, though in no doctrinaire spirit. But the foundations of belief cannot be laid in any philosophy. This task must begin where Dr. Rashdall leaves off; with what is nearest to our own experience; with our own moral and religious con-

sciousness rather than the Universal Mind ; with the concrete needs of men rather than the necessities of thought ; with the actual beliefs of the human race rather than the speculations of philosophers. It was in Judæa not in Hellas that men knew what they worshipped. The data of theism are not the dialectical distinctions of academic discussion.

Only a little space remains to speak of some of the essays in detail. It is singular that Mr. Wild, who professes to give us a conception of the teaching of Christ based primarily upon the narrative of St. Mark and the Matthaean Logia, should quote so largely from the Authorised Version, even where it is distinctly a gain to employ the Revised, or that at times he should seem to quote from a not too accurate memory. 'Then should ye say to this mountain be thou plucked up and be thou planted in the midst of the sea' is apparently a confusion. And it is astonishing that he should read the Old Testament in the earlier version, especially when quoting Daniel vii. 13, 14.

It is disappointing that Mr. Burney's essay shows no advance upon the work of older critics in readjusting the balance between Law and Prophets. The true proportions were sadly missed in the first shock of the discovery that the Mosaic legislation in its developed form was later than the eighth century. We now see that the opposition between Ritual and Righteousness was a false one, and that Prophecy as distinguished from the Ceremonial Law does not exhaust the religious value of the Old Testament.

When Mr. Allen declares that 'criticism of the New Testament is and must be apologetic and defensive,' both critics and apologists will demand some qualification. If it were defensive in its purpose it would no longer be independent. That all criticism is defensive in its results is manifestly untrue. What is true is that the best criticism has, in Mr. Allen's words, 'set at rest for ever doubts as to the chief features of the life and teaching of our Lord.' It is not enough to say that certain lines of criticism 'are not very convincing.' When, for example, we have P. Wernle supporting his theory that Luke had read the narrative of Mark by explaining two notable omissions on the ground that the

healings in question were too coarse and vulgar for the ears of the later disciples ; and another, the incident of the sons of Zebedee, because it would lack interest after the death of the apostles concerned ; we are constrained to hold that there is a considerable amount of subjective ineptitude in the criticism of German commentators. It is because Mr. Allen fails to give sufficient emphasis to this side of the matter that we regard his otherwise careful and painstaking survey as somewhat less reassuring than he would have desired to make it.

Mr. Carlyle would have consulted his reputation, whether as historian, theologian, or master of the English tongue, by refraining altogether from his essay on the Church, which displays an awkwardness of expression resulting from the absence of unity in design, exactness in knowledge, and precision in statement. No attempt is made to correlate the various aspects of the Church, which in the New Testament is but one. The Church 'known only to God' is summarily dismissed, with the consequence that the visible Church becomes a temporal, though Divine, institution, the purpose of which is not the exercise but the development of the spirit of brotherhood. Mr. Carlyle refers the apostles and other ministers mentioned in 1 Cor. xii. 28 to the visible Church, without seeming to realize the ideal character of the whole passage. His historical survey of the growth of the Christian ministry, with its redundant qualifications and vague generalizations, would be excusable in the mouth of a well-informed clergyman, not claiming expert knowledge, at an impromptu debate. Its conclusion, that 'in time the new system of organization (episcopacy) spread over the whole of the Churches and became the normal type of Church government,' is manifestly true, but what we want and do not get is a principle combining the various stages of development. At length we find ourselves without much warning discussing the Protestant Reformation, and are told that if we will 'take the trouble to study' this document, and 'be at the pains to read' that treatise, and, lastly, 'take the trouble to reflect,' we shall see that the Lutheran doctrine of justification involved the substitution of a spiritual for a

formal religion. Finally, we are assured that the overthrow of mediæval authority is in part the cause to which 'we may very well trace our deplorable divisions,' and take leave of the subject with the pious resolve 'to do what we can under our present conditions, while we also try to remedy them.'

The apology which Mr. Inge offers in his discussion of the Sacraments for the uncompromising adoption of the historical and comparative method is unnecessary. He is only carrying out the implications of St. Paul's argument concerning idol sacrifices and the Eucharist. Metaphysic has been the bane of Eucharistic controversy, and we look to such constructive arguments as that which Mr. Inge has followed to bring about that unity of thought and feeling which attempts to harmonize existing statements of doctrine are powerless to effect. The reverence of its tone and a certain charm of diction, rendered the more effective by contrast, will make this essay attractive even to dissentient readers. With its main conclusions we find ourselves in substantial agreement.

ART. VII.—THE CREDIBILITY OF THE ACTS
OF THE APOSTLES.

1. *The Acts of the Apostles.* An Exposition. By RICHARD BELWARD RACKHAM, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection. (London: Methuen and Co., 1901.)
2. *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles.* Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1900-1901. By FREDERIC HENRY CHASE, D.D., President of Queens' College and Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1902.)
3. *St. Luke the Prophet.* By EDWARD CARUS SELWYN D.D., Head Master of Uppingham School. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901.)
4. *Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles.* By EDWARD WHITE BENSON, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901.)
5. *The new Volumes of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.'* The first of the new volumes, being Vol. xxv. of the complete work, p. 57. 'Acts of the Apostles.' By J. VERNON BARTLET, Professor of Church History, Mansfield College, Oxford.
6. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. p. 64. 'The Acts of the Apostles.' By the Rev. J. A. CROSS and the Rev. R. B. RACKHAM.
7. *Criticism of the New Testament.* *St. Margaret's Lectures*, 1902. 'The Historical Value of the Acts of the Apostles.' By J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Trinity College, Dublin, Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.

IN a previous article of the *Church Quarterly Review* we reviewed certain recent criticisms of the Acts of the Apostles, and discussed at some length the question of authorship.¹ We intimated at that time a desire to return to the subject and to discuss more fully the historical value of the book, and we expressed a hope that we might shortly have some assistance in the task. That assistance has come, and we

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. liii. No. 105, October 1901, p. 1.

are glad to express our obligations to it. The English reader can now have a sound and useful commentary in the book of Mr. Rackham; the whole question of credibility is ably discussed by Dr. Chase; the orthodox lover of ingenious and unsubstantial speculation can have it gratified by Mr. Selwyn, without having recourse to Dr. Cheyne or Professor Schmiedel; and the journalist who wants to get up the subject in a few minutes will have a sound *résumé* of recent work by Mr. Bartlet in the new volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

To take the least important first. It is of good augury for the treatment of religious topics in the new volumes of the *Encyclopædia* that we should find such a sane contribution as that of Mr. Bartlet. The fact that he comes from Mansfield College makes us all the more pleased to find that we are in substantial agreement with almost all his conclusions. He writes with full knowledge of recent literature, and is a safe guide to current opinions. Our chief criticism is that he has neglected to notice that recent chronological investigation does away with the main reasons for thinking that St. Paul's death occurred at the close of the two years mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, 31. The same reasons do away with the necessity for accepting Mr. Bartlet's theory of the Pastoral Epistles, a theory for which he will hardly succeed in getting wide assent.¹

Mr. Rackham's work is more ambitious and more important. It is written for English readers:

'The readers kept in view have been, in accordance with the general intention of the series, the educated English public, who are not, technically speaking, "scholars" or "students."'

Unlike most commentaries written for the unlearned, it is written with full and ample learning, and is for its purpose an admirable work. It begins with an excellent introduction, and both there and in the commentary there are no modern sources of knowledge which are neglected. Mr. Rackham is, indeed, more up to date than Mr. Bartlet. The section of the introduction which we should be most inclined to criticize

¹ See the article by Mr. Turner, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxvii. p. 85.

is that on the theology. It would, we think, have been better for the purpose which Mr. Rackham has ultimately in view if he had treated the doctrine of the Acts from a more historical point of view. The signs of development within the period covered are among the most striking proofs of the credibility of the author, and to a reader who has caught the spirit of modern thought the representation of Christian doctrine in a formative condition will carry more conviction than the attempt (perfectly legitimate in itself) to fit it into a dogmatic form. What every reader will feel is the immense pains that Mr. Rackham has taken to make his readers understand quite adequately. To do so means very great labour. Mr. Rackham shows that he has a sufficient mastery of the subject to have written a book which would have taken a high place and added to our knowledge, yet he has with great self-abnegation contented himself with producing one which will enable the general reader to learn the results of scholarship without being bewildered by its technique.

Dr. Chase's Hulsean Lectures on the *Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles* is a very interesting book. He sets on one side the ordinary subjects of discussion and the ordinary line of defence—the question of Theudas and other small points in the archæological evidence—and devotes his four lectures to an analysis of the narrative and of the speeches, asking the question how far they witness to their own trustworthiness. Does the narrative give a natural and credible account of the growth of Christianity, of the manner in which problems arose and were discussed and solved, of the means by which the Church passed from one stage to another, and the borders of Christianity were continually enlarged? Are the speeches of St. Peter and St. Paul of the character and type which might reasonably have been delivered at the time? Do they harmonize with the contemporary Jewish conceptions, out of which Christianity grew, with the early teaching of the Gospel and the other movements of primitive Christianity, or are they such as would be invented by a clever rhetorician who writes his history from the point of view of late doctrinal developments? All these questions are treated adequately and ably. We are less inclined to agree with

Dr. Chase's discussion of the events of the day of Pentecost. It seems to us to have the faults always incidental to explaining away a miraculous narrative. It may be possible that the events did not happen as they are described, that the narrative of St. Luke is exaggerated and 'mythical'; but if that be so we have no way of ascertaining what part is exactly true. There is no standard of comparison, no criterion. All rationalistic or semi-rationalistic reconstructions of early legends are more unsubstantial than the legends which they are intended to simplify and strengthen.

Dr. Selwyn's book on *St. Luke the Prophet* is a work of quite a different type. Dr. Selwyn writes like an amateur who has taken up the study of primitive Christianity, has found it very interesting, has discovered a good many things which he did not know before and therefore thinks were not known, and sets to work to ride them to death. He begins by stating that one object of his book is to combat a kind of Agnosticism. By this he means the habit of applying the formula, 'We do not know,' to details of the New Testament. Certainly anyone who accepts Dr. Selwyn as his guide need not be troubled with Agnosticism. But we very much doubt whether many scholars will prefer his wealth of information to the wise suspension of judgment and sober self-criticism which generations of scientific inquiry have taught us. We are not only asked to believe that St. Luke was a prophet, but that he was the same person as Silas or Silvanus, and that under that *alias* he wrote the two Epistles of St. Peter, and that under another *alias*, that of Tertius, he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. When St. Luke wanted to describe a missionary journey of St. Paul, he looked up the book of Joshua to see if he could not arrange the names of the places in such a way that their first letters might correspond to the first letters of places mentioned in the conquest of Canaan. All the prophets read the Book of Enoch with great care, so that if a word occurs in any of the New Testament books which is found in Enoch, it must have been taken from it. We have neither the time nor space to examine all the strange conjectures and speculations which Dr. Selwyn has managed to get together, and to distinguish the elements of truth

which he has so strangely perverted. We are content to split with him on his fundamental thesis, that the author of the Acts was in any valid sense of the term a 'prophet.' To us the Third Gospel and the Acts are the least prophetic and most Hellenic books of the New Testament. Their writer is clearly an historian in the best sense of the word. By his opinion on this point alone Dr. Selwyn would convince us that he had not the critical faculty requisite for the work that he has undertaken.

The *Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles* by the late Archbishop of Canterbury is a book of a very different character. It is not directly critical, and is not, perhaps, written with a very full knowledge of technical criticism; but the Archbishop was a scholar, and the incidental remarks that he makes are often of great interest. We are, however, very glad to mention these *Addresses* in this connexion, because, after all, the religious value of the Acts of the Apostles will always remain, for the mass of the people who read it, the incontestable proof of its value and authority. The *Addresses* themselves are full of interest, both for their actual religious value and for the reflection they give of a very thoughtful and cultivated mind.

Dr. Bernard's contribution in the St. Margaret's Lectures is necessarily very slight, but is a thoughtful and wise discussion of many of the points at issue.

We note with interest that all these writers agree in accepting the Lucan authorship, and we may pass on to further points. Wild confusion seems to prevail on the subject of the text in some writers' minds, but the judgment of Mr. Bartlet will be eventually held to be right:

'On the whole, then, the text of Acts, as printed by Westcott and Hort. . . seems as near the autograph as that in any other part of the New Testament; whereas the "Western Text," even in its earliest traceable forms, is secondary.'

On the date there is the usual variation of opinion. Mr. Bartlet gives a normal, and perhaps correct, opinion when he places its composition between the years 71 and 80; Mr. Rackham adheres to the period before 64. The only strong

argument against this view is that it compels us to put St. Luke's Gospel at an almost impossibly early date, and St. Mark's Gospel still earlier. This is not probable; and if there is anything in the tradition given by Irenæus, that St. Mark wrote after St. Peter's death, it is impossible. But apart from this there is no valid reason against the earliest date, and, as Harnack sees, from the point of view of literary criticism there is much to be gained by placing it as early as possible. But if we are allowed to say that it was written before the year 80 it is enough for our present purpose.

We now pass on to ask whether St. Luke was a credible writer, and whether his history is trustworthy. We know, to begin with, that he professes to find out information and to get good evidence. He tells us that he had used both written and oral information in the Third Gospel, and throughout the Acts the idea of witness is one on which he lays great stress. To him, an educated Greek with some scientific training, coming to Christianity from outside, the natural question would arise, Is there good evidence for all these things I am told? He would inquire into the matter, and he gives in his two historical works the result of his inquiries. We know, again, in the case of the Gospel how he uses his sources. We can compare the sections that he takes from St. Mark's Gospel with the original, and note the extent of the changes. He to a certain extent rewrites his source in his own language; he improves the style, and makes it more literary; but he does not change the doctrine or the narrative. So far as we can judge, there is less change than in St. Matthew's Gospel, and far less tendency to arrange facts and discourses from a dogmatic point of view. The analogy of the Gospel would make us expect that St. Luke would collect information from the best sources at his disposal, and reproduce it as faithfully as he could in accordance with his literary instincts.

Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of the sources of the Acts, and are left to conjecture. On this point at present great diversity of opinion prevails. Mr. Bartlet writes: '*Quellenkritik*, then, a distinctive feature of recent research upon Acts, is a solvent of many difficulties in the way of treating Acts as an honest narrative by a companion of St.

Paul.' On the other hand, Dr. Chase writes in a less confident manner, and his words are worth quoting :

'I have said that the literary analysis of the Acts as a clue to the written documents out of which it was thought to be built up is a study which has had a fascination for certain Continental scholars. The remarkable characteristic of these efforts is that they have been independent and isolated. They are of interest as the records of the impressions of ingenious individuals; but they have proved too subjective and too arbitrary to command anything approaching a general acceptance. They have not been confirmed by progress towards a coherent theory. May I without presumption state how my own opinion on this question of the sources of the Acts has been modified? I began the study of the Acts some years ago, in the full expectation that I should discover signs of the use of various written documents. The investigation appeared at first to promise success. I found differences of phraseology in the several sections of the book. But when after a time I reviewed the evidence, and asked myself whether it was such as would bear the weight of a theory of different literary sources, I was constrained to confess that the variations of style which I could trace were only such as might be expected in a sympathetic author, whose manner instinctively answered to his immediate subject, or such as any writer may observe in his own case if he lays aside his work and resumes it after an interval.'

He would ascribe St. Luke's knowledge of the early years of Christianity almost entirely to his acquaintance with the principal actors. One authority would be St. Paul himself. He had met Philip the Evangelist. At Jerusalem he would be able to learn much from the earlier disciples, and perhaps from St. James; at Rome he very probably met and associated with St. Peter. So far we agree with him. But we cannot help still believing that there were certain written sources. All *Quellenkritik* has failed hitherto, and probably always will fail, in any attempt to estimate the limits of the documents; for St. Luke did not write like a chronicler. But the admitted variations in style may be taken as satisfactory evidence for the existence of at least one written source in the earlier chapters, which preserved, as St. Mark had done, the record of St. Peter's preaching.

There is no doubt that St. Luke had ample opportunity

of obtaining good information, but was he capable of making use of it? On this point we have a very interesting means of testing him. He incidentally has occasion to allude to many points on which classical archæology (in the broadest sense of the term) can speak authoritatively. On most points we can speak with absolute certainty as to whether or no he is accurate. The question is not one of opinion, but of scientific history. How does he stand the test? We propose to compare on this point what Mr. Rackham says with Professor Schmiedel, and in our opinion it enables us to test not only St. Luke, but his critics. Let us first hear Mr. Rackham :

'We shall be abundantly satisfied as to St. Luke's historical accuracy if we reflect on the extraordinary test to which it was put—*i.e.* the variety of scene and circumstance with which he had to deal. The ground covered reached from Jerusalem to Rome, taking in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. In that field were comprised all manner of populations, civilizations, administrations—Jewish and Oriental life, Western civilization, great capitals like Antioch and Ephesus, Roman colonies, independent towns, Greek cities, "barbarian" country districts. The history covers a period of thirty years, which witnessed in many parts great political changes. Provinces like Cyprus and Achaia were being exchanged between the emperor and the senate; parts of Asia Minor, *e.g.* Pisidia and Lycaonia, were undergoing a process of annexation and latinization. Judæa itself was now a Roman province under a procurator, now an independent State under a Herodian king. Yet in all this intricacy of political arrangement St. Luke is never found tripping. Instances of supposed mistake or anachronism have, indeed, been alleged and laid to his charge; but after examination (as will be pointed out in the commentary) we are fairly entitled at least to answer that they have not yet been proved. On the other hand, St. Luke is equally at home with the Sanhedrin and its parties, the priests and temple guard, and the Herodian princes at Jerusalem; with the proconsuls of Cyprus and Achaia, the *rulers of the synagogue* and *first men* of Antioch in Pisidia, the *priest of Zeus* at Lystra, the *praetors, lictors and jailor* of Philippi, the *politarchs* of Thessalonica, the *Areopagus* of Athens, the *Asiarchs* with the *people, assembly and secretary* of Ephesus, the *centurions, tribune and procurator* of Judæa, the *first man* of Malta and the *captain of the camp* at Rome. Such accuracy would have been almost impossible for a writer compiling the history

fifty years later. In some cases where his statements had been impugned St. Luke has been signally vindicated by the discovery of inscriptions, as in the case of the politarchs of Thessalonica and the proconsul of Cyprus. Historical research is also throwing fresh light on the *captain of the camp* at Rome and the *Italic* and *Augustan cohorts* at Caesarea. This holds out good hope that further study or discovery will remove what difficulties and uncertainties still remain. This hope is, indeed, receiving a remarkable fulfilment at this moment. The one great stumbling-block in St. Luke has been the *enrolment* or *census* of Quirinius; and great authorities like Mommsen and Schürer have pronounced him guilty of error. But recent discoveries in the papyri of Egypt seem likely to clear up the difficulty by giving fuller information about the imperial census.'

Now let us hear Professor Schmiedel on the same subject:

'Ramsay thinks he has discovered such proofs in the accuracy with which geographical names and contemporary conditions are reproduced in the journeys of Paul. Some of the most important of these points will be considered elsewhere. Of the other detailed instances, many will be found to break down on closer examination. . . . But it is not necessary to go thus into details which might be adduced as proving the author's accurate acquaintance with localities and conditions. For Ramsay attributes the same accuracy of local knowledge also to one of the revisers of the text, assigned by him to the second century A.D., whose work is now preserved to us in D., and also to the author of one source of the *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, assigned by him to the second half of the first century, whose work, however, he declares to be pure romance. If so, surely any person acquainted with Asia Minor could, even without knowing very much about the experiences of Paul, have been fairly accurate about matters of geography, provided he did not pick up his information so late in the second century as to betray himself by his language, as, according to Ramsay, the above-mentioned reviser, whose work lies at the foundation of D., has done. In point of fact, Weizsäcker thinks that in Acts xiii. f. the account of the route followed does come from an authentic source, but yet that the contents of the narrative are almost legendary. . . . But, after every deduction has been made, Acts certainly contains many data that are correct; as, for example, especially in the matter of proper names, such as Jason, Titius Justus, Crispus, Sosthenes, or in little touches such as the title *πολιτάρχης*, which is verified by inscriptions for Thessalonica, as is the title of *πρωτος* for Malta, and probably the name of Sergius

Paulus as pro-consul for Cyprus. Only, unfortunately, we do not possess the means of recognising such data as these with certainty where confirmation from other sources is wanting.¹

To us the tone of Professor Schmiedel's writing sufficiently condemns him as a fair critic. In the first place he obviously minimizes the evidence very much; in the second place, he concludes with an absolutely impossible canon of criticism. According to him St. Luke is to be believed only when he is corroborated. The right canon is that if, when he can be checked, he is corroborated, he must also be believed elsewhere unless there is any strong argument against it. But we can go further. All these little points of accuracy regarding quite irrelevant and unimportant matters show that St. Luke has the character and instincts of an historian. He notices and notices accurately, just the points in which a careful observer would be interested, and if he is accurate and interested in the details of civic organization we may assume that he is accurate and interested in the details of ecclesiastical organization. He is never a careless writer where we can test him. He may, of course, have made his mistakes like any other man, but the verdict of criticism will certainly be ultimately with Mr. Rackham, and we shall approach the further consideration of the subject with the bias in favour of our author which is given us by finding him accurate in just the points in which we can test him.

There are many sides to the question which we can only pass over cursorily. There is the relation of the Acts to the Epistles of St. Paul. We have already discussed the main difficulties which have been raised under this heading,² and for the rest we can only echo the remark of Dr. Bernard:

'The argument resting on the "undesigned coincidences" between the Acts and the Epistles, put forth by Paley in the eighteenth century, is not yet superseded in the main, although some details require modification; and Paley's *Horae Paulinae* may still be recommended as an introduction to the "Higher Criticism" of the New Testament.'³

¹ *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, i. 46.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, loc. cit. p. 11.

³ *Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 217.

There is, again, the argument from the natural development of events, the suitability of the speeches to the occasions when they were delivered, and their doctrinal characteristics. All these are well worked out by Dr. Chase, and we will pass them over, as there are one or two more difficult questions on which we wish to dwell.

The first is the accuracy of St. Luke as a portrayer of doctrine and doctrinal development. We know that St. Luke wrote both the Gospel and the Acts; we know that he lived in a later generation, that he had come under the influence of St. Paul's teaching; yet he manages to observe and to make quite clear the differences of doctrinal impression between the different periods in Church history.

Let us take, first of all, a point which can be expressed by vocabulary. If anyone will take the trouble to look out the expression *πνεῦμα* or *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* in the Concordance he will see what we mean. The one definite fact in the Apostolic age was the belief in the Holy Spirit; it coloured all the thoughts of the writers, it impresses itself on all their language. Now the Gospels were written by men in this age, men who were not trained to any great critical discernment in the use of language. Should we not expect to find the language of a later date influencing early records? Yet on this point the phraseology is kept almost entirely distinct. While the expression *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* occurs forty-one times in the Acts, it occurs only thirteen times in St. Luke's Gospel, and, of these instances, six are in Chaps. I. and II. Or take the word *ἐκκλησία*. The Acts of the Apostles are full both of the word and of the idea expressed by it. We might expect some vestige of this to creep into the earlier period, but the word never occurs in St. Luke's Gospel. But take another term, that of the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the kingdom of God. While the expression in some form or another occurs about thirty-eight times in the Gospel, it occurs only seven times in the Acts. It was natural enough that the word should be given up. It was liable to very serious misconstruction, and it would not have nearly the same significance when used among Gentiles that it had among Jews. What is remarkable is the correctness with which the changes in phraseology are reflected

in all these cases. The same is, of course, true with regard to the titles and names of our Lord. There is a mode of phraseology and a method of speaking of Him which are common to all the Gospels, and not merely to the Synoptic Gospels. There is another mode in St. Paul's Epistles. The Acts does not correspond to either, but it represents the process of development from the earlier to the later period. And in it there is a marked contrast between the earlier and later chapters.

Another very remarkable case is the relation of the work to the story of the Virgin birth. It is quite clear that this was not an ordinary part of the missionary teaching of the Apostles. If it was taught at all, it would be part of the catechetical instruction, and it is very probable that in the earliest period knowledge concerning it was not widely diffused. But St. Luke was certainly acquainted with it. No one can doubt that who reads his narrative in the first chapter of his Gospel. It is quite true that Professor Schmiedel would omit as interpolations certain verses which conflict with his own opinions; but that is a method of criticism which is quite unscientific; and, moreover, it is not sufficient for his purpose, for the idea of the Virgin birth colours the whole narrative, and especially the story of the Annunciation. But although St. Luke is quite well acquainted with this belief, he does not in the least consider it necessary to drag it into his narrative in the Acts. He gives the teaching of the Apostles as it was; he does not attempt to harmonize it with the Gospel narrative. He omits the Virgin birth in the one, he places it in the other where it ought to come. We may conclude, therefore, that he gives the teaching as it was, and does not attempt to harmonize it; and, further, that the absence of any particular doctrine does not in the least imply that the writer is ignorant of it. St. Luke knew and believed in the Virgin birth, but does not mention it in the Acts; St. Paul may perfectly well have known and believed in it, although he never mentions it explicitly.

It is a remarkable fact, but any careful reader of the Gospels will support it, that the theology implicit in St. Luke's Gospel is in many ways much more advanced than the

explicit theology of the Acts. Yet the Gospel was undoubtedly written first, and was clearly not influenced, except slightly, by later phraseology. There is one explanation, and one only, which will satisfy all these different phenomena. While the teaching in the Gospels implied much more than was at first grasped or formulated, this teaching has been in all essentials correctly and accurately handed down, being very little influenced by the phraseology of later forms of expression. This teaching was behind the Apostolic activity, but only gradually did the Apostles realize its full significance or develop a terminology which would express it. It is this process of development which is portrayed with such marvellous accuracy in the Acts of the Apostles. The speeches of St. Peter in the first chapter represent the earliest Apostolic theology. How primitive this is even Professor Schmiedel is prepared to admit :

‘It is hardly possible not to believe that this Christology of the speeches of Peter must have come from a primitive source. It is, nevertheless, a fact sufficiently surprising that it has been transmitted to us by a writer who in other places works so freely with his sources.’¹

We are inclined to ask in passing how the writer is aware that St. Luke has worked up his sources. The only answer is that his treatment of the earliest period does not harmonize with the presuppositions of the critic—a reason which is very unsubstantial. The more reasonable argument would be that he was probably historical in his treatment of other matters, as he certainly is historical in treating this, and that he gives us a much better picture of the primitive Church than modern writers can construct out of their own consciousness.

At any rate, we may feel convinced that the doctrine implied in the early chapters is primitive. The remaining portion of the book depicts for us the gradual development from this primitive teaching. St. Stephen’s speech, the later speeches of St. Peter, the speeches of St. Paul, mark a gradual growth in fulness of expression, and the highest limit in

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 48.

doctrinal development is reached in the speech to the Ephesian elders.

Let us now pass on to the last point which we have space to discuss—the miracles related in the Acts, especially the miracles in the early chapters. If we ask what is the real reason why the credibility of the Acts is doubted, the answer would be that it is not for the reasons given—which are only the excuse for maintaining a position arrived at on other grounds—but, to a subordinate extent, because it gives a picture of the primitive Church inconsistent with the ideas, however formed, of the critics, and still more because the miraculous character of many of the incidents absolutely precludes, it is alleged, the historical character of the work. Now there are two questions which are often confused together. The first is: Does the existence of the miraculous in the book take away from the value of the narrative in other matters? And the second, Did the miracles really happen?

Let us begin with the first. Not only do we believe that the writer remains credible, but we may go further, and say that if the narrative had been entirely unmiraculous we should have grave reason for doubting its historical character. The first duty of an historian is to record accurately what he has seen, or to give the result of the investigations that he has made. Now, it is perfectly clear that the early Christians believed in miracles; St. Paul claims to have worked them himself, and appeals to them as one of the signs of his commission. Whether or no the miracles happened, it is quite certain that his contemporaries believed that they did. If St. Luke, therefore, gave accurately either what he read or what he heard about the earlier days at Jerusalem, he would certainly give a narrative containing miracles; if he gave accurately what he was told about St. Paul's journeys by companions, or what St. Paul himself had said, there would clearly be cases where it would have been believed that the power of the Spirit had been shown by events which were considered miraculous. Whether or no St. Peter and other Apostles had seen angels, we may feel quite certain that they

would believe that they had. We may here quote what Dr. Bernard has said :

'Belief in God's will and power to work in ways which seem to us miraculous does not necessarily make a man an inaccurate observer or an untrustworthy historian. It may be that the author of the Acts classified as "miraculous" some occurrences in which we, with our wider knowledge, would perceive only the operation of the ordinary laws of nature and of God ; but that, if true, would only prove that he was a man of his own time, and not of ours. In brief, we have no sort of title to assume that the miracle stories of the Acts are necessarily untrue ; and, in the second place, the fact that the author records them without any hesitation does not put him out of court as an historian.'¹

But we must now pass to the more fundamental question, Are these miracles true ? We cannot, of course, be expected here to discuss the whole question ; it is only part of a wider inquiry. We will confine ourselves to one or two more definitely historical aspects of the problem.

Let us take first the miracle at Pentecost, and ask, putting aside questions of detail, Did anything happen ? We have already noticed a very remarkable fact. The literature of the Gospels (except in one connection) is marked by an almost complete absence of any reference to the work of the Spirit ; the literature of the Apostolic age is marked by the vivid realization of the power and work of the Spirit. The distinction is clear and undoubted. What caused this ? Just as the evidence for any historical event is not only the actual account of what happened, but also its after-effect in history ; just as the evidence for the Resurrection is not only the actual narratives, but the whole of the post-Apostolic history, so the evidence for the miracle on the day of Pentecost is the belief in the Spirit and the signs of the work of the Spirit during the whole of the Apostolic period. Something must have happened. The Acts give an adequate cause.

And now, if we may be allowed, let us look at the question from the point of view of a believing Christian. The whole narrative is self-consistent. The life of Jesus is the preparation and the message. The Apostles are only slowly con-

¹ *St. Margaret's Lectures*, p. 211.

verted. It takes some time to make them realize everything. The Gospel period is that of the teaching concerning the second Person of the Trinity. But already the promise is given of the revelation of the Spirit. It is in this way that most of the references to the Spirit came in the Gospels. Then came the Resurrection, and faith, largely shattered by the terrors of the Crucifixion, is renewed and strengthened. Then come the gift of the Spirit and the immediate outbreak of religious life, followed by the gradual but complete realization of the meaning of the Gospel revelation. The whole narrative is self-consistent, and gives an adequate account of a stupendous revolution in human thought.

Here we may stop. Subsequent history is to us the strong corroboration of the reality of the Resurrection and the miracle of Pentecost. There may be differences or discrepancies in detail in the narrative, as there are in the details of many historical events in secular history ; but we need not be troubled by them, and may discuss them as we would other details ; and if the great miracles happened, there is no *a priori* reason against other miracles having happened. We do not mean to imply that there are no difficulties in detail, either in the narrative or in the character of many of the lesser miracles, but that the fact of their miraculous character is not in itself a difficulty. The revelation of God in Jesus Christ in the Gospels, and of God through the Spirit in the Apostolic age, was marked by a real and undoubted heightening of spiritual force in the world, and by the visible power of the Spirit over matter. If that is recognized, then we are willing to admit that each narrative may in itself demand careful examination, just as each narrative which is not miraculous demands it.

We have said that there may have been mistakes or exaggerations, and if the narrative itself contains difficulties, these difficulties must be examined, but we do not think that the method adopted by Dr. Chase is at all sound. He suggests semi-rationalistic explanations of phenomena which seem to be miraculous. Here he is substituting what is quite uncertain for what is rather uncertain. The events may have happened as recorded. Some points may suggest

that they happened in rather a different way. We have not two accounts controlling one another, and we may not be certain of the actual way in which they occurred. But to imagine something wholly different from what is narrated as an explanation is nothing else than bad criticism. We may not be quite certain that events happened as St. Luke describes, but we are quite certain that his narrative is nearer the truth than Dr. Chase's poetical fancies.

'May not He who by what we call natural means shrouded the cross of the Son of God in darkness have ordained that, at the moment when the illuminating Spirit was poured upon the Church, the sunlight of a new day smote upon the Apostles? And if so, was it unnatural that Christians should see a deeper meaning in the sun's rays streaming through the colonnades and the arches of the Temple and resting upon the Apostles, and, connecting the sight with the wonders of Apostolic utterance which ensued, should play upon a not uncommon use of the word "tongue," and speak of "tongues like as of fire" resting on the Apostles?'

This is to us purely fanciful. Our conclusion, then, is, that the miraculous character of the Acts does not diminish our belief in the trustworthiness of the author; that there is no *a priori* reason against the truth of the narrative; that for the great miracles there is the strong confirmation of the whole history of the Apostolic period, which would be inexplicable without them; that about the details of events we cannot always be certain, or about the way in which particular things may have happened, but that that is true also of some of the narratives of unmiraculous events. It is better, therefore, to avoid being too anxious to find explanations, and to be content with a certain amount of suspension of judgment. As Dr. Sanday said at the Church Congress:

'Of course, any such explanation can be only partial. The lower cannot supply an adequate measure of the higher. And, by the hypothesis, we are dealing with causes which stretch away beyond our ken. We should, therefore, be prepared to exercise much caution and reserve in judging. It is natural and right that we should dwell most upon those instances which are to us most "intelligible," and from which we can draw the most instruction. It is also natural and right that we should read the Gospels critically

—that is, with attention to the different degrees of evidence in different parts. But it would be wrong to leap hastily to the conclusion that whatever we fail to understand did not therefore happen. It is probable that our successors will be better equipped and more finely trained than we are ; and just as in the world of Nature many things that once seemed incredible are now seen to be both credible and true, so also it may be in the sphere of revelation.'

It has, of course, been quite impossible for us to deal with the subject at all adequately within the limits assigned to us. The conclusions which we have arrived at we can only shortly sum up. All the evidence appears to us to point to St. Luke as the author, and to bear witness to his trustworthy character as an historian. He had very good sources of information from personal contact with the leaders of the early Church. This he was probably able to supplement, to an extent which we cannot at present determine, by a written source for the earlier period ; but he uses his material so skilfully that it does not seem possible to separate the source from the later additions. He arranges his material with great skill, so as to exhibit the natural process of development in the Apostolic period. He sketches the steps, so far as he has been able to trace them, by which Christianity had spread through the world, from Jerusalem as the centre. He enables us to see how the Apostles gradually learned to realize the full meaning of the universality of the Gospel. He is interested in many points of secular and ecclesiastical customs, has skill in observation, and generally supplies us with the correct technical terms. His cast of mind is Greek, not Hebrew ; Christianity is to him an institution as well as a system of teaching—an institution for spreading the knowledge of Christ and faith in Him, and the discipline of Christian life throughout the world.

ART. VIII.—THE STUDY OF GREEK.

1. *The Times*, November 17 and 18, 1902.
2. *The Cambridge Modern History*. Vol. i. Chapter xvi.: 'The Classical Renaissance.' By Sir RICHARD C. JEBB, M.P., Regius Professor of Greek.

ON November 18 last the question of the retention of Greek as a compulsory subject in Responsions was debated in Congregation at Oxford, and those who were in favour of allowing a modern language to be substituted for it were defeated by a very narrow majority. It is needless to remark that a letter from one of the leading opponents of Greek appeared in the *Times* the next day, suggesting that the result was misleading and the issue was confused. Anyone at all well acquainted with the Progressive party at Oxford is aware that they can very rarely be made to recognize that the reason that they are defeated is that the majority disagree with them. But in any case we must be prepared for the subject being again introduced, probably in a more insidious form; and if the motion is carried in Congregation the question will be brought before Convocation, and an appeal will be made to the educated opinion of the country at large. Cambridge spoke some years ago with no uncertain voice, and it may be necessary for the non-resident members of the University of Oxford to assert their continued belief in the value of a liberal education.

We should be surprised—if we did not bear in mind the memorable words of the youthful orator in the College Debating Society: 'Sir, I have lived long enough to be surprised at nothing'—at the clamour we so often hear against the study of Greek. Truly, as Sancho Panza has taught us, 'There are many odd things in the world.' Now more than ever science, whether about things mental or material, needs the fineness of touch, which no other language has in the same degree, for her multifarious work of defining, sorting, analyzing. Now, more than even in the century of the Renaissance, the culture in which ancient Greece still stands

unrivalled is almost deified. Now the specialty of our studies is to exhume the records of the past. Now the attention of religious people is turned, as in the days of Casaubon, to the investigation of old manuscripts. And yet now is the time chosen for a vehement assault on the study of the language, history, literature of the Hellenic race. It might be added, that the disparagement of Greek is all the more strange at a time when the athletics, in which Hellas has excelled all nations, are exalted in England to the dignity of an art, a science, almost a religion.

Several causes concur. In the march onward of humanity there is a law at work, from which there is no escape, that the fashions of one period must be reversed by the period which comes next, and that the pendulum must swing so far in the new direction as it has swung in the old. Also, the study of 'dead' languages—if anything so instinct with the vitality of thought and emotion can be so styled—is crowded out by other studies for want of room. Above all, the world is in a hurry; there is too much pushing through the crowd to snatch unripe fruit, too little patience, too little of that best quality in a racer—the power to stay. Accordingly, a study which men of art, of science, of literature, historians, theologians, &c., all know to be inestimable, will be lost unless timely consideration may avert such a catastrophe.

The question is too large to be settled from a merely professional standpoint. Eminent scholars, such as Professor Robinson Ellis, or the late Mr. Shilleto, can, of course, testify with special force to the value of what they can appreciate so well. But a question like this needs a very wide horizon, and must be looked at from many sides. It will be best to regard the various aspects of it severally, dwelling especially on those which are less obvious than others.

The place of ancient Greece in the history of the world is unique. Half a century ago Lord Sherbrooke, more famous as Robert Lowe, in one of his vigorous speeches¹ denounced what he called the lamentable waste of time in the study of Greek. Standing on the Acropolis, and looking down on

¹ See *Quarterly Journal of Education*, February 1868.

the insignificant dimensions of Athens with its suburbs, he wondered what infatuation could possess men to spend time and trouble on a thing so small. The words are unworthy of a really clever man. Possibly there lurks in them an unconscious sense of resentment against his old University. Milton was wiser :

‘Behold

Where on the Ægean shore a city stands,
Built nobly, pure the air, and light the soil,
Athens the eye of Greece, mother of arts
And eloquence, native to famous wits
Or hospitable, in her sweet recess,
City or suburban, studious walks and shades ;
See there the olive grove of Academe,
Plato’s retirement, where the Attic bird
Trills her thick-throated notes the summer long ;
There flow’ry hill Hymettus, with the sound
Of bees’ industrious murmur, oft invites
To studious musing ; there Ilissus rolls
His whisp’ring stream. Within the walls then view
The schools of ancient sages ; his who bred
Great Alexander to subdue the world,
Lyceum there, and painted Stoa next.
There shalt thou hear and learn the secret power
Of harmony in tones and numbers hit
By voice or hand in various-measured verse,
Æolian charms and Dorian lyric odes,
And his who gave them breath, but higher sung,
Blind Melesigenes, thence Homer called,
Whose poem Phœbus challenged for his own.
Thence, what the lofty grave tragedians taught
In chorus or iambick, teachers best
Of moral prudence, with delight received
In brief sententious precepts, while they treat
Of fate and chance and change in human life,
High action and high passion best describing.
Thence to the famous orators repair,
Those antient, whose resistless eloquence
Wielded at will that fierce democratie,
Shook th’ arsenal and fulminated over Greece
To Macedon and Artaxerxes’ throne.

To sage philosophy next lend thine ear
 From heaven descended to the lowly house
 Of Socrates. See there his tenement,
 Whom well inspired the oracle pronounced
 Wisest of men ; from whose mouth issued forth
 Mellifluous streams that watered all the schools
 Of Academics old and new, with those
 Surnamed Peripatetics, and the sect
 Epicurean, and the Stoics severe.'—*Book IV.*

We make no apology for this long quotation, for possibly our younger readers are more familiar with *Atalanta in Calydon* than with *Paradise Regained*.

Tennyson, too, was wiser than Lord Sherbrooke :

'Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.'

Must all this be sacrificed to our haste to be rich ?

Greece has been, as Freeman loved to reiterate, a break-water against the tide of invasion from the East, and the struggle for life against Xerxes and his myriads was a rehearsal of Eastern Europe's stubborn resistance in the Middle Ages to Turk and Saracen. It is not, however, in that feature of her history that the secret lies of its attraction for students, but in the microcosm of the separate States which made up Hellas, with their separate policies, wars, alliances, and clearly chiselled individuality. No community ever realized so intensely as Athens and Sparta the collective responsibilities of citizenship, and yet none other was ever so rich in the fulness of personal development of the citizens one by one. A climate¹ 'gilded by eternal summer,'² the configuration of a coastline diversified by endless indentations, a landscape breathing inexhaustible inspiration—all these things combined to foster the free expansion of the individual, with, at the same time, a paramount sense of loyalty to the 'city.' The story, as Thucydides tells it, of the Peloponnesian War, like the stories of Florence, Pisa, Genoa, &c. in the pages of Sismondi, is an object-lesson for

¹ Δι' ἀβροτάρου αἵθερος. Sophocles.

² Byron, *Childe Harold*.

statesmen in all time. When John Bright said that there is more to be learned from a number of the *Times* than from all the books of Thucydides, he was forgetting that the wisdom of the modern publicist is an outcome of experience garnered from the past. Just as the history of the tiny States of ancient Greece, in their complications with one another, is a world-history in miniature, so the history of their internal policies is an epitome of the conflict, for ever recurring, between wealth and poverty, the few and the many. The chancelleries of modern Europe, the Downing Street of our own island, can learn much, if they will, of statecraft from these old annals.

Similarly, the literary treasures unlocked by the knowledge of Greek as it was written of old are a little world in themselves. Scarcely can any department in literature be named that has not its model and prototype in the golden age of Athens. No aspect of life but is touched by the philosophy of Plato, the poetry of the Athenian drama. Of course, these (and the Homeric epics, &c.) can be read in English by those who are ignorant of Greek; but no one who knows will say that this is the same thing as to read them in the original. Champagne decanted loses its sparkle and flavour. Truly, to lose the literature of ancient Greece is to leave the spring out of the year.

The influence in this way of ancient Greece on the world has been even greater indirectly than directly. Greece cannot claim, like Rome, to have had a world-wide empire, for the conquests of Alexander were ephemeral. And yet, through Rome, Greece has dominated the civilized world. The trite saying of the courtier-poet of Augustus, acutest of observers, 'who never said a foolish thing,' though perhaps he 'never did a wise one,' is true in a wider sense than he intended:

'Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit.'

Roman legions, with their compact array, serried shields, and levelled pikes, subdued the nations; Roman lawyers, with their strong judicial instinct, legislated wisely for the vanquished; but it was Greece that moulded the inner life of the Roman Empire by the subtle enchantments of art and

literature, and by all the refinements—sometimes, alas! enervating—which make up civilization. Southern Italy to this day is far more Greek than Roman. Its people have the suppleness, the grace, the versatility of Athens, not the stern unbending dignity of the Trasteverini. The ‘Dying Gladiator,’ the Apollo of the Vatican, breathe the sentiment and reveal the plastic fingers of the land of Phidias. Tear out the page of Hellas from the annals of Europe, and you make all that follows unintelligible: the imperial influence of Rome, the taming of the Barbarians, the chivalry of feudalism, the efflorescence of the fifteenth century, the marvellous material progress of our own era. To know Latin is something, but to know the sayings and doings of the nation which marched before Rome across the stage of the civilized world is many times more precious. The old fancy is exploded that Latin is derived from Greek; but it is true to the end that the mantle of Greece, in her glory, dropped on the shoulders of her victorious successor. To divorce the study of Latin and Greek is to rend asunder two lives bound together indissolubly.

There are exceptional men, as Cobbett and Abraham Lincoln, thoroughly masters of English without knowing any other language; but as a rule it is very difficult to write or speak English perfectly without knowing Greek. Even apart from the elasticity which comes from mastering the most copious and the most clear-cut of all languages, the mere fact that many of our words are derived from the Greek is important. Very often the real meaning, the inner sense of a word, reveals itself only in this way. It will be an evil day if ever (which happily is unlikely) a ‘fonetic’ jargon, obliterating the origin of words, shall reduce English to the level of a Polynesian dialect.

The wisest men of ancient Greece were children in physical science—very clever children, making at times very clever guesses at the truth, but inexperienced as children are. But in mental science the teachers on the banks of the Ilissus are still unapproached, unapproachable. The outlines of psychology traced by Aristotle are ineffaceable. The progress of physical science may show that the workings of thought

and emotion are resolvable into physical causes, but it cannot eliminate, what is the cardinal point in Aristotle's psychology, the supremacy of the deliberate choice,¹ the casting vote of the will, either enlightened and free or a slave to the impulse of the senses. After all, the study of man is more interesting than the study of his environment.

But some will rejoin, What is all this to ordinary persons in England to-day? Granted that the intellectual treasures to which Greek is the passport are priceless to students, that the world would be poorer without the poetry of Homer and the dramatists, that the eloquence of Demosthenes is as far above Cicero's finest declamations as John Bright is above Gladstone in oratory, that the mental philosophy of Stagira still holds its place in the van of modern thought, that no translation can give the flavour and zest of the original, that for the literary man and the statesman, the artist and the student of Nature, the philosopher and the theologian, Greek is indispensable if he would rise to the height of his vocation, still the question remains, Is there any use in forcing the Greek grammar and lexicon on reluctant boys and youths at school and college generally? Might not their time be spent better? Is there not an adequate substitute for Greek in their case?

Many will allow readily that Greek ought to be retained as one of the special studies of Oxford for those who like it, just as entomology or conchology has its votaries; also, that there should be a professorial chair to encourage those who care for such things to become familiar with the antiquities of Greece, and to provide editions, with all the latest emendations, of Plato, Herodotus, and the rest. But they demur to requiring Greek generally, and they deny that it deserves to be made a *sine qua non* for anything in the shape of a degree or for entrance into the University.

It is important to keep this aspect of the controversy apart from the other, as distinct essentially, though in some measure parallel to it; for to the end of time, however much the level of average teaching for the million may be raised,

¹ ἡ προαίρεσις.

those who have leisure from manual toil and capacity for climbing the heights will be in a minority. Is the learning of Greek in itself and apart from the ulterior advantages which have been mentioned, a good discipline for whatever may be the future career? Is it really the way to fit men to play their part well in the arena of life? If it is, none who are wise will be in haste to displace it from the course of study.

These are memorable words of the late Sir James Paget on another subject: 'The knowledge of it was useless; the discipline of acquiring it was beyond all price.'¹ Even if the learner forgets, before many years are past, the little that he has picked up of Greek at school or college, 'the discipline of acquiring it is beyond all price.'

The aim of all education which is worthy of the name is to train the faculties, rather than to impart knowledge. To pour information into the pupil's brain, however useful the information may be, instead of stimulating and guiding his receptivity, is 'cram.' It clogs and dulls and enfeebles the faculties which it ought to sharpen and strengthen, just as undigested food weakens the bodily frame. In the early stages of education the learner is *learning how to learn*; for the rest of his life, till the very end, he is using the power thus acquired. Of course, where the time is short this preliminary process must be curtailed. The question, however, now is not about elementary schools, but schools of a higher type.

What, then, are the mental habits, the formation of which ought to be the aim of a sensible system of education? Observation and memory. The due cultivation of these implies the power of sorting, adapting, combining what we know; it leads to accuracy, quickness, resourcefulness; it involves to some degree moral qualities, such as industry, patience and fidelity. Certainly it would be absurd to say that these results can only be attained by learning Greek. It is not absurd to say that to learn Greek, if the teaching is judicious, is a pre-eminently effective way to this attainment.

No language can be compared with Greek in universality. It has the energy of Northern Europe with the pliability of

¹ *Guardian*, August 13, 1902.

the South ; it has the nice precision of French, the musicalness of Italian, the sturdy downrightness of German ; in versatility, in copiousness, in the symmetry and exactness of its grammatical structure, it stands alone, incomparable. Like the Nasmyth hammer, it can forge an anchor or fashion a lacework of iron. The notion has been, Greek for the learned professions *only*. No. For Army, Navy, Civil Service, counting-house, where can we find anything really adequate to take the place of Greek, merely as a preparatory exercise ?

There is a certain order, not to be disregarded with impunity, in education—words, things, ideas. Not seldom the failure, when education fails, comes from disregard of this fundamental law. The study of words comes naturally first, for though thinking is possible without words, thinking is grievously hampered, nor can be distinct and expeditious, without verbal expression, words being the symbols, the counters, the shorthand of thought. The study of facts comes next, for the learner has to amass facts, to be distinguished and classified, in order to have something for hypothesis to work upon, a *ποῦ στῶ* for generalizing, without which theorizing is merely beating the air. Last in proper order comes generalizing. Language, history (in the full sense of the word), philosophy—here is the syllabus of a sound education. As always happens, the three stages in this process necessarily overlap one another, and are in part simultaneous, though progressive and consecutive in the main. Grammar is the foundation of the edifice.

Time ago there was a phrase in vogue which one does not often hear now—a '*painful scholar*,' one who takes pains, who is (it was a favourite word with James Riddell) *ταλαιπώρος*, who in the pursuit of knowledge does not shrink from self-denying toil, who plods on perseveringly through difficulties. So it is in Greek grammar. Even the tiresome drudgery of noting breathings rough and smooth, accents sharp and flat, &c., by the close attention which it exacts, is an incentive and a discipline to the faculties of the mind. The preciseness of the laws which govern the syntax and the metre are, to say the least, a good treadmill for the learner.

The study of Greek exacts in a quite special degree close

and careful observation, a clear and retentive memory; it exercises continually the habit of distinguishing one from another things separated by very slight and very delicate shades of difference, almost endless, yet always according to law. No language exemplifies in its every detail so remarkably as Greek the presence of law; and it is the boast of our own day to have discovered the presence of law everywhere. In its complex and exquisite organization Greek resembles one of the mechanical contrivances which are the glory of our engineering skill. There are minute and elaborate adjustments and counterpoises almost without end; and yet the whole thing is simple enough when the law is grasped which regulates it. In learning Greek the richness of the vocabulary and the intricacy of the grammar can be mastered only by resolution and perseverance—in fact by the very same qualities of character which will stand the learner in good stead when he shall have to face the fortune of war in a campaign, or an adverse majority in Parliament, or a panic, as of 1880, on the Stock Exchange. The learning of Greek may be distasteful and irksome not infrequently, like learning the alphabet or the notes on a piano, but the very difficulty enhances the value of what is gained by the effort. The Russian is said to be an apt linguist because of the difficulty of his own language. It is often objected that boys (and men) while struggling with a hard sentence are quite unappreciative; that 'very little Greek sticks to them when all is done, and that they soon forget that little.' But even so the mere effort has been good: the energy expended on doing a thing is really, after all, worth far more than the actual value of the thing done. The repugnance and distaste which have to be overcome must be reckoned on the profit side of the balance-sheet, for nothing strengthens and ennoble like surmounting obstacles. If it is an axiom in education that one must find out the special aptitude, which means vocation, it is true equally that one ought to compel oneself at times to work against the grain. Vigorous exercise is healthy.

In this respect can we devise a good substitute for Greek? French is suggested by some; and it is urged that so there would be the additional advantage of acquiring a language,

which even now, the German victories of 1870 notwithstanding, is practically useful almost everywhere in the civilized world. French is a delightful language, especially for conversation, and English people whose lot is above the necessity of constant manual work ought to learn it, just as English people ought to learn more generally to swim. But French is learnt more easily, more intelligently, more thoroughly after learning Greek and Latin than before;¹ and it can be acquired far more quickly in a few weeks at Rouen or Tours than by months of study at home. As for French at schools, there is a practical quandary; the teacher, if English, is apt to be less expert; if French, less competent to keep order. It would be rash to assert that French, with all its charm as a language, can supply the same drill for mental and moral faculties as Greek. Probably the unstudious boy would hardly carry away from school more French than now Greek. Certainly his mind and character would not have had the same discipline.

Would mathematics or chemistry answer the purpose as well as Greek? Possibly, as far as accuracy goes. But accuracy (with retentiveness of memory) is not all that is wanted. Studies such as these touch only one side of man's nature; they teach about his environment, but he is greater than his surroundings; they leave out man; they are inhuman.² The average boy may be uncritical of the personages in the epic or the drama, nor very much on the alert as to the drift of the story; yet somehow he takes it in. He has his preferences and aversions; he gives his vote for or against the hero and the rest; he is penetrated, half unconsciously, it may be, by a sense of ethical fitness; he is all the time, though happily he knows it not (he would be a 'prig' if he did), building up his own character. It would be like leaving the Prince out of Shakespeare's greatest play to put chemistry or mathematics in place of Greek and Latin. These 'dead' languages have been alive, which cannot be said of ciphers or of inorganic matter.

¹ Examiners have said that a sounder proficiency in modern languages can often be noticed in students who have not been on 'the Modern Side' exclusively.

² The old phrase, '*literae humaniores*,' has a meaning.

'But it is a barrier against poor students ; it shuts them out of the University to require Greek in Responsions.' The objection is unreal. The youth really in love with knowledge, who seeks admission into Oxford or Cambridge for the sake of what he can learn, is not so easily deterred ; he contrives somehow, as many a sturdy young peasant in the northern part of our island can testify, to surmount the difficulties in his way, and he becomes twice a man for the effort. What he knows he knows all the more thoroughly because of having to conquer it without the appliances which make the path too easy. Other causes, financial, social, repel the poor student, not the requisition of Greek.

We have discussed the question in its wider bearings ; let us look at it for one moment from one or two other points of view. An argument, very serious in coming from practical men, is based on the fact that in a pass examination a certain number of those who get through have not apparently profited by their work, and have only crammed up the subject for the examination. But the same would be true much more of algebra or Euclid, which it is not proposed to abolish, and which in many professions are absolutely useless. In every examination and in every system there must always be hard cases, and weak men who pass with difficulty, and persons who have found their subject distasteful, or been hampered by inadequate early training ; but no wise man legislates for hard cases. It might be right that there should be a dispensing clause, and that the University might by decree of Convocation except certain persons ; but that is the utmost that should be done for those who suffer from any accidental disability. To change the system, to do away with compulsory Greek from Responsions, means to disarrange the education of almost all the schools in the country. It means that Greek will be not a normal subject of instruction, but a special subject, taken up by those who wish to stand for university scholarships in classics. All who study mathematics, or science, or even modern history, will be exempt from it, and many men will go up to the University of Oxford and find that they are practically debarred from the great school of *Literæ Humaniores* ; the one subject which they

will discover might be seriously worth their while to study. The young man who wished to take Orders would know that even the alphabet in which the New Testament was written would have to be mastered, at an age when such drudgery would be particularly distasteful, and would wonder what could be the benefit of the smattering of French which he had acquired to one who was too poor to travel and had no taste for commercial pursuits, or of the elementary science which a couple of handbooks would teach him in a few hours. Those who regret the time spent on the study of Greek when they were young forget that they do not know what they would have been like without it. Take away the great basis of educated thought, the slight but widespread acquaintance with the greatest of languages and literature, and the whole basis of modern life is transformed.

But there is always a school who are clamouring that the University ought to be more widely useful, who appeal to the Rhodes Scholarships and the colonial Premiers, and ask that it should take its place as a great influence in the Empire. No one could be more anxious than we are that both the Universities should exercise a wide influence in the Empire and in the world, but it must be by raising the world to their standard, not by lowering themselves. Let them say clearly and definitely that, whatever the claims of physical science (no one will neglect it, while there is so much money in it) and the commercial advantages of modern languages may be, the mental culture of the future as of the last four hundred years must be based upon the two great classical languages and their literatures, and they will create an ideal to which education all over the world may look. There is great danger in the spread of a universal education that the lower may swamp the higher. There is more need of the high priests of learning when learning is so widely extended. The wisdom of the New World is built upon the emancipation of the human mind which the spread of Greek initiated. Are we quite sure that when Greek goes we shall keep what it has brought?

We have placed at the head of this article a reference to Sir Richard Jebb's admirable chapter on the Renaissance in

THE
to se
draw
ment
of th
long
Tübingen
theol
mainl
and
years.
versia
incess
auther

the *Cambridge Modern History*. It tells us of the rise of Humanism and the power that Humanism exercised. The influence of intellectual studies is so subtle that the world is inclined to pass them over; yet we often wonder how far either the Reformation or the creation of the modern world would have been possible without the silent influence of the revived classical studies. There is the possibility now of a tyranny of science as powerful and even more barbarous than that of scholasticism. It is not the more humane and liberal aspects of religion which will flourish most when mental culture declines, and we can only express our earnest hope that the Universities will ponder well before they make the great revolution which is implied in general culture by the abolition of compulsory Greek.

ART. IX.—THE ST. MARGARET'S LECTURES.

Criticism of the New Testament. St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902. By W. SANDAY, D.D., F. G. KENYON, D.Litt., Ph.D., F. C. BURKITT, M.A., F. H. CHASE, D.D., A. C. HEADLAM, B.D., J. H. BERNARD, D.D. (London: John Murray, 1902.)

THE Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, has been quick to see and meet a real need. Attention is being gradually drawn off from the problems presented by the Old Testament literature, and is being fixed once again on the criticism of the New Testament. In this direction there has been a long respite. Twenty-five years ago the attacks of the Tübingen school were occupying the energies of our great theological scholars. A furious assault was driven back, mainly by the learning of Lightfoot, Westcott, and Sanday; and 'the land had rest' in that quarter for some twenty years. The Old Testament then had its turn of controversial interest. But the New Testament scholars were incessantly at work, probing more deeply than ever the authenticity of the canonical books, collecting fresh mate-

rials for the criticism of the text, storing up new results, and modifying accepted theories. The time had arrived for a plain statement by leading scholars in various departments, such as might enlist the intelligent sympathy of a thoughtful public which has neither the time nor the training for special inquiry, but which can appreciate a careful description of the methods and results of modern biblical studies. Such a statement is offered us in these lectures. Mr. Henson has succeeded in inducing some of the foremost of our New Testament scholars to speak out in clear language and say what they have been doing and where they stand. Each topic in this course is treated by an acknowledged authority ; and while any educated man can easily follow all that is said, there are but few professed students who will not read these lectures with interest and profit.

The introductory lecture is given by Dr. Sanday. It is, as his writing always is, of a reassuring character. His wide knowledge and cautious survey teach us how many are the problems, how various the solutions offered, how much good work is being steadily carried on by our own English scholars. If a criticism is to be offered on his lecture, it must be that he is almost too kindly in his judgments of the work of others—so kindly, in fact, that he leaves us completely in the dark as to what his own opinion is. This may be illustrated from his curious silence as to the date and authenticity of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Whether he agrees with Dr. Bigg, whose work he appears to estimate so highly, we cannot require him to tell us ; but ought he not to have said plainly that Dr. Chase does not accept the Petrine authorship or an early date, and that there is a serious divergence among equally 'orthodox' critics at this point? The student who knows the ground well is not likely to be led astray ; for he notes the very careful language in which doubtful questions of this kind are dealt with ; but the plain man will find perhaps too much comfort in these balanced sentences.

The very valuable lecture on Manuscripts by Dr. Kenyon of the British Museum is the work of a student of the textual criticism of the New Testament who brings to his task an

unrivalled knowledge of palæography and of the materials of which ancient manuscripts consist. He speaks with an authority of his own on the passage of books from the roll to the codex, and from papyrus to vellum. The historian as well as the textual critic will gain from the masterly summary which he offers of the chief points in this transition. There are but few scholars either at home or abroad who could offer an authoritative criticism of this portion of his lecture.

When he comes to discuss the existing varieties of text, he prefers to abandon the customary appellations, Syrian, Western, Alexandrian, and Neutral, and to entitle these groups by the letters α , δ , γ , β respectively. It may be questioned whether he fully appreciates the position of Westcott and Hort, to whom the designations above mentioned are due in their present acceptance. It may be only ambiguity that is to be charged against the following sentence :

‘The marked appearance of Latin authorities in this group led Westcott and Hort to call it the *Western* group ; but the name is misleading, and consequently here, even more than elsewhere, a non-committal name is preferable, and it may be called the *Delta*-group (δ).’

An intelligent person, not acquainted with the history of textual criticism, would probably understand from this that Westcott and Hort were originally responsible for this ‘misleading’ name. It may be well therefore to refer to their Introduction, § 153, where they speak of it as ‘an appellation which has for more than a century been applied’ to the leading members of the group in question. After challenging its accuracy in certain respects, they determine for convenience to retain it, saying :

‘Whatever may have been the original home of the “Western” text, change of designation would now cause more confusion than it would remove, and it remains true that the only continuous and approximately pure monuments of the “Western” texts now surviving have every right to the name.’

The fact is that these local names, if carefully guarded, have the advantage over purely colourless designations. They can be easily remembered, for they convey some meaning ;

whereas 'non-committal' letters give the mind nothing to fasten on, and so require a perpetual effort of memory. The particular assignment of letters which is now before us has the further disadvantage that it cuts across that which Westcott and Hort use in their preliminary discussion before they consider the local naming of the groups, for with them the 'Syrian' text is δ , the 'Western' is β , and the 'Neutral' is α .

In regard to the term 'Neutral,' Dr. Kenyon's misconception deserves to be challenged. Speaking of the group which is mainly represented by \aleph and B, he says: 'This group Westcott and Hort call the *Neutral* group, indicating thereby their belief in its superiority to its rivals.' Such a statement does not correspond with the reason which these critics themselves assign for their choice of the word. After speaking of Western and Alexandrian readings, they say (Intro. § 231): 'On the other hand, the rival readings cannot be exactly described except in negative terms. Against a Western stands a non-Western pre-Syrian reading; against an Alexandrian stands a non-Alexandrian pre-Syrian reading.' It is these readings and the text to which they belong that are described as 'Neutral,' as in the following sentence (§ 234): 'If, then, a pre-Syrian text exists, which is Neutral, that is, neither Western nor Alexandrian,' &c. It is true that they were led to regard the 'Neutral' text as 'comparatively pure'; but by 'Neutral' they mean 'Neutral'; and they ought not to be taken, as they are too commonly taken, to beg the question of 'superiority to its rivals.' It is probably the topsy-turvy method of calling the latest text the α -group that is responsible for the confusion and unintentional misrepresentation into which Dr. Kenyon has fallen; for it is impossible to understand the designation 'Neutral' until the two powerful rivals have first been brought under consideration.

Apart from these points Dr. Kenyon is admirable, both in his exposition of the work of Westcott and Hort and in his statement of the attitude of the younger critics towards it. New material has come to hand, and the 'Western' text has now a better chance of vindicating itself at particular points than it had twenty years ago. We are coming to recognise

more fully that 'Western' readings are of very varying values. We are not so ready to dismiss them 'in the lump' as bad. And in our discrimination we remain true to Dr. Hort's method, as anyone must admit who remembers and appreciates his 'Western non-interpolations.'

This excellent lecture concludes with the words: *Fortis est veritas et praevalebit*. It would be interesting to know how the lecturer came by them. We are accustomed to find *praevalebit* in newspapers, but *fortis* is unfamiliar.¹

Mr. F. C. Burkitt's lecture on Versions is another example of the advantage of setting a scholar who has devoted much attention to the details of a particular study, and has really advanced it, to put down in plain terms the chief fruits of many years of labour. Like Dr. Kenyon, he is a layman who has rendered important service to the Church by his biblical investigations; and it is wholly appropriate that such students should be invited to offer the serious results of their work in a sacred building which is so closely connected with Westminster Abbey and rightly claims a share in its liberal traditions. In the course of his lecture Mr. Burkitt is happy in his reference to two former Canons of the Abbey and Rectors of St. Margaret's who have taken a part in the studies to which he himself has made so large a contribution.

The lecturer simplifies his subject by reducing the number of important versions to two—Latin and Syriac. Here at once we note an important advance; for the Egyptian versions (especially the Bohairic, or, as it used to be called,

¹ In I (3) Esdras iv. 41 we read: 'Et omnes populi clamaverunt et dixerunt, Magna est veritas, et praevalet' (i.e. it is stronger than wine, king, or woman: ὑπερσχύει). This misquotation seems to be as firmly rooted in the modern mind as 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,' and 'Christianos ad leones.' For the former see Vincentius, *Commonitorium*, § 3: 'In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.' This corresponds to his threefold division just below, *universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem*. What is the history of the corruption? For the latter see Tertullian, *Apol.* 40: 'Si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si caelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim *Christianos ad leonem* adclamatur. Tantos ad unum?' The grim retort, 'So many to one?' ought to have protected the quotation.

the Coptic) were until quite recently regarded as going back possibly to the latter part of the second century ; but it was shown in Mr. Forbes Robinson's article in Hastings's *Bible Dictionary* that the native Egyptian was not much touched by Christianity till the end of the third century ; and Mr. Burkitt himself speaks with authority in describing these versions as 'bound up with the development of monastic life.' Of the Latin and Syriac versions he concerns himself mainly with the pre-Vulgate forms in each case ; and he puts in a strong plea for those readings, usually spoken of as 'Western,' which have the attestation of the Old Latin and the Old Syriac, or, in other words, of the Western and Eastern regions of early Christendom. He is not much moved by the absence of direct manuscript evidence for them in Greek, especially when he can discover some patristic references to bear them out. He gives three examples of variants which commend themselves to him on the ground of the Versions. One is Matt. xxvi., where the virgins 'went forth to meet the bridegroom and the bride' ; for so he would have us read. There is not much to be said on internal grounds against this reading, if we are content, as we should be, not to press the details of a parable too closely. But Mr. Burkitt's interpretation, 'Christ is the bridegroom and the bride,' will hardly commend itself, and perhaps is only due to his recollection of the queer text quoted by Tichonius, 'I am the bridegroom and the bride.'¹ His next instance is more open to challenge. It is the omission in Matt. xi. 5 of the words 'the poor have the gospel preached to them.' In the parallel passage, Luke vii. 22, they are undisputed ; and Mr. Burkitt's theory is that they were not present in the common source which the two Evangelists used at this point, but were added by St. Luke himself. It is to be observed, however, that both these words and the earlier clause, 'the blind receive their sight,' come from Isa. lxi. 1 (εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς . . . τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν) ; and it is reasonable to suppose that the two

¹ This arose from a misreading of *sp̄s et sponsa* in Rev. xxii. 17 as *sponsus et sponsa*, and its subsequent connexion with the previous verse : the resultant reading being, 'I am the bright and morning star, the bridegroom and the bride.'

allusions come from the same hand. Moreover, though it is true that the verb *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* occurs often in St. Luke, and never (apart from this disputed passage) in St. Matthew, yet the strange passive use of it (*πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*) has no further attestation in St. Luke. It is as awkward a phrase in Greek as Wiclif's rendering of it is in English ('the beggars be *gospelled*'); and, though St. Luke might retain it, we may fairly doubt whether he would have introduced it. We are not, therefore, inclined to accept this as a 'Western non-interpolation' in St. Matthew. The third instance is the omission from John xii. 8 of the words, 'For the poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always.' The internal ground for suspecting these words is 'the sudden verbal agreement in the midst of so much material divergence': 'the removal of the words about the poor takes away the sudden and inexplicable literary resemblance between St. John and the Synoptic Gospels; here again, therefore, we may believe that the Syriac Palimpsest from the East and the Græco-Latin MS. from the West have preserved the true text.' The point is of great interest; but before we come to a decision we must observe that a previous sentence, 'Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?' consists almost entirely of words found in Mark xiv. 5, and also that the word *ἐνταφιασμός* in the clause preceding the disputed words is found nowhere again in the New Testament except in Mark xiv. 8 (even St. Matthew avoids it by a paraphrase at this point). However questionable these interesting examples may be, the principle which they are chosen to illustrate is of great importance, and it has never been so clearly and ably stated. The reader of this lecture will understand how a loyal disciple of Dr. Hort may be led by a fresh access of materials to modify at certain points the great master's results.

Dr. Chase's task is a very different one from those of his immediate predecessors. It is largely a task of classification of a vast store of materials, most difficult of appreciation to persons who are not already familiar with the remains of early Christian literature. He has succeeded in dealing with the Canon of the New Testament in a fresh and interesting

manner, and at certain of the chief points of debate he speaks with the authority of a scholar who has made the best recent investigation of his subject. A statement here and there may perhaps be challenged, and an addition may sometimes be desired where scanty evidence has recently been reinforced. But his judgments are cautious, and his combination of clearness and fulness is remarkable. When he says that Hippolytus does not once quote the Epistle to the Hebrews in his extant works, he may be correct as far as express citation goes; but the discovery of the Commentary on Daniel has done much to justify the previous supposition that he knew and used this Epistle. Bonwetsch (*Texte u. Unters.*, new ser. I. 2, 25) goes so far as to say that 'the very fact that Hippolytus did not regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's makes it the more noteworthy that the use of it in the Commentary on Daniel falls but little behind the use of the Pauline Epistles.' Again, as the Acts of the Scillitan martyrs is our earliest dated document of Christian Latin (A.D. 180), it might have been of interest to have given the answer of the martyrs when they were asked what they had in their chest: '*Libri et epistulae Pauli viri justī*'; and also to have noted what seems to be a reference to the Pastoral Epistles, where one of them says: '*Illi Deo servo, quem nemo hominum vidit nec videre his oculis potest*' (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16). Dr. Chase brings out boldly the various degrees of attestation which belong to different books of the New Testament. 'It is a serious confusion,' he says, 'if we regard the Gospel of St. John as possessing no greater attestation than the Second Epistle of St. Peter. In the Canon of the New Testament there is the clear noon of certitude and the twilight of ambiguity.' His lecture leaves a true impression of the great weight of authority with which the main portion of the New Testament comes to us from the earliest times for which we have any evidence at all, and also of the wise suspicion and reverent jealousy with which the limits of the Canon were guarded.

To make an interesting lecture on 'the dates of the New Testament books' is something of a feat, and Mr. Headlam has certainly accomplished it. His method is to take the

general teaching of the earliest Christian writers outside the Canon, and to ask where it came from and how its resemblance to the language of the presumably Apostolic writers can be explained. He shows, both in his lecture and in the valuable appendix of quotations and parallels from writers of the earliest period (95-120 A.D.), that the bulk of the New Testament must have been written in the first century. Thus he gets at the heart of the problem. For, if this be so, the area of controversy is greatly narrowed. Even if one or two books should still be assigned to a later period, the historical position is not affected: the central facts and the essential doctrines of Christianity are securely attested; and our minds are set free to consider without anxiety the details of chronology. The argument is a strong one, and is well worked out. In a few points of detail the lecturer will perhaps not command general assent. In dating the *Didaché* as between 80 and 110 A.D., he warns us that he does not speak with confidence. It might be wiser to say that the manual called 'The Two Ways,' which is embodied in it, is probably of the first century, if not pre-Christian; but that the part of the book from which the illustrations of New Testament language are drawn is almost certainly later than 110, and may represent an isolated Christian community even of the middle of the second century. Again, the Epistle of Barnabas must surely not be dated as 'perhaps shortly after 70 A.D.,' even though a lower margin of 125 A.D. be allowed as possible. It is true that Lightfoot was inclined to place it early, but he stands practically alone in doing so; and for the particular argument of this lecture the lower date is alone of any value.¹

In the discussion of individual books the least satisfactory section is that which deals with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

¹ The suggestion that it is 'perhaps a sermon' appears to be inconsistent with its opening sentence: *Χαίρετε, υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς ἐν εἰρήνῃ*. This marks it as a treatise under the thin disguise of a letter. We find *χαίρε* as an introductory form in some of the papyrus letters from Egypt: e.g. *Berlin Pap.* 435, *χαίρε, Οὐαλεριανέ, παρὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*, and 821, *χαίρε, κύριέ μου πάτερ Ἡρόδοκος· σὲ ἀσπάζομαι*. Cf. Origen's letter to Gregory which begins, *χαίρε ἐν θεῷ, κύριέ μου σπουδαιότατε καὶ αἰδεσιμώτατε νιὲ Γρηγόριε, παρὰ Ὀριγίνους*.

It is curious that writers on this Epistle but seldom guard their language so as to exclude, as the author of the Epistle excluded, any reference to the Temple. It is not 'the rites of the Temple' with which he is concerned. His knowledge of Judaism is apparently not derived from actual contact with it as a living religion; it is book-knowledge, like that of St. Clement of Rome. In each case it is quite possible that the author is a Gentile by birth, who may have been prepared for Christianity by an admiring study of the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures. He may have found his way to the Synagogue, but not to the Temple. To such a man the Tabernacle and its rites are what he knows as divinely sanctioned; the Temple is a later development and of secondary importance. If this be so—and the possibility of it is at least worthy of consideration—'the feeling of being cut off from the rites of the Temple and the Jewish ordinances' is not the difficulty which the writer was seeking to mitigate, nor does the fall of Jerusalem much concern us when we are endeavouring to fix the date of the Epistle.

One other point in which this lecture will hardly escape criticism is the statement that 'the differences of style and subject-matter' which we observe in the Pastoral Epistles 'are hardly greater than between other groups of the Pauline Epistles, and may be quite sufficiently accounted for by the later date and the different style and character of the writings.' The recurrence of the word 'style' indicates that the lecturer has not quite clearly expressed his meaning, or that the sentence has suffered in the printing. But, apart from this, the statement is much too broad. If Dr. Hort's authority were quoted for the general conclusion that, in spite of all differences, we must continue to assign these Epistles to St. Paul—and this is, no doubt, what Mr. Headlam wishes to say—yet it must be remembered that Dr. Hort allowed the existence of a problem in their literary history which, with our present knowledge, we are not in a position to solve. Difference in vocabulary may be partially explained (though only partially in this instance) by difference of subject-matter and of date; but the use of particles is one of the most unailing of literary tests. The change in the use of particles

and the comparative rarity of the definite article form, together with the startling divergence in vocabulary, the chief ground of our perplexity. We must at present be content with saying that none of the modern [theories offer solutions which are satisfying from the literary and historical standpoint, and that accordingly we are not justified in deserting the well-supported tradition which assigns these Letters to St. Paul. If we knew what share the Apostle's amanuenses had in shaping the style of his Letters, we might conceivably find a clue that might help us; but on this point we are quite in the dark.

The whole of this lecture is vigorous and instructive. The author of it is right in claiming that the advance of our knowledge in recent years has been generally favourable to those who keep to the earlier dates, and generally unfavourable to the few critics now left who regard the second century as the creative period in Christian literature. The judicial temper of the lecture is as reassuring as its conclusions.¹

The last lecture of the series is by the Dean of St. Patrick's. Its subject is of great importance; for 'the historical value of the Acts' has been much depreciated by continental scholars, and at home we have had till lately only the counterblast of Professor Ramsay's enthusiasm for St. Luke as an historian. Dr. Bernard gives us a quiet exposition of the literary problems of the book, and a useful recapitulation of the striking confirmations of its author's accuracy which the inscriptions have afforded. He brings out well the difference in character between the first twelve chapters and the rest, and lays stress on their primitive and Hebraic tone. He makes out a fair case for 'an underlying document' in these earlier chapters: but we may hope that he will reconsider his present belief that this document was Semitic. There is no substantial evidence that any book of

¹ A few misprints may be noted for the editor of a second edition. We can hardly suppose that Mr. Headlam, even when his imagination is at its liveliest, would put 2 Peter 'later than the year 464 A.D.' (see p. 180). On p. 176 'the letter' should be 'the latter'; on p. 152 'the Spirit' should be 'the spirit'; on p. 172 'Polycrates' appears as 'Polycartes.' Other lecturers have been treated more kindly by the compositors; but on p. 127 we find 'Cheltenham.'

the New Testament, or any document underlying any part of any book, was originally written in a Semitic language. Of course, conversations and speeches were spoken in a Semitic language, and no doubt some primitive records were written by men who thought in Semitic while they wrote in Greek. That is all that we can securely say ; and it is enough to meet our reasonable demands. To go farther in the present case is to raise the question on the other side, whether St. Luke could have read a Semitic document if he had come across one.

The writers of these lectures are not of the kind that would resent criticism ; and the book has seemed well worthy of being criticized. It is a book to be commended not only to the general reader who wishes to know what our most learned and sober critics hold on many disputable points, but also to the younger students at our universities who are entering upon the serious investigation of the problems of New Testament criticism.

ART. X.—THE BIRMINGHAM BISHOPRIC.

1. *Worcester Diocesan Calendar*, 1902. (Birmingham : Midland Educational Company.)
2. *Census Returns*, 1901, *Counties of Worcester, Warwick, and Stafford*. (London : Eyre and Spottiswoode.)
3. *A Bishopric and a Cathedral for Birmingham*. By S. ROYLE SHORE. (Birmingham : Midland Educational Company, 1902.) 6d.
4. *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, April 15, 1902, &c.
5. *Worcester Diocesan Magazine*, November 1902 (containing report of Diocesan Conference). (Birmingham : Midland Educational Company.)

And private information.¹

THE returns of last year's census, now in course of publication, cannot fail to arouse grave questions in the mind of a

¹ We desire to thank Mr. Walter N. Fisher for information kindly placed at our disposal, and also Mr. S. Royle Shore for the loan of a useful collection of newspaper cuttings and other papers.

thoughtful Churchman. For they tell of a steady drift of population into the great industrial centres; they remind us of the long lines of mean streets extending all round our large towns, of suburban parishes submerged and overwhelmed, of Church extension societies struggling with inadequate resources to cope with an ever-increasing demand. In the last decade the population of Leeds has grown from 367,000 to nearly 430,000, that of Sheffield from 324,000 to 380,000, and that of Leicester from 174,000 to 211,000. These are examples, chosen almost at random, of the process that has been going on in all our larger towns, and the problem thus presented to our Church is one of appalling gravity. Perhaps the most hopeful sign of the times is the gradual growth in these great centres of population of a municipal feeling which, though weak as yet, may ultimately convert the amorphous masses into organized communities. But meanwhile, how far is the Church meeting the new claim thus being made on her? That she has a message to these great industrial centres she is every day learning to realize with stronger conviction. But how can the message be spoken?

Much is being done in the creation of new parishes and the development of archidiaconal activity, but if unity and force is to be given to these efforts it must be by a large increase of the episcopate. A bishop who emerges occasionally from the quiet haven of his cathedral city to attend a committee, or preach a sermon, or take the chair at a meeting in Leeds or Leicester or Birmingham, can never hope to be other than a stranger to the masses of the people—welcomed respectfully and even warmly, but a stranger still. If a bishop is to be in any real sense an overseer, he must be at the centre of the organized life of the community over which he is set, in touch with the men who are making its history, standing for the Church in civic life, asserting, unobtrusively but not the less definitely, her right to voice the claims of Christ in the social life of our great cities.

There is another reason that may be urged for dividing some of our present dioceses. Unrestricted parochial independence is, we may hope, destined soon to become a thing of the past. But the reassertion of episcopal authority, if it is to achieve any real good, must mean a great additional

burden. Our bishops must meet in conference to insure and maintain uniformity of interpretation, they must be much more fully in touch than they are at present with the mass of the Church laymen of their dioceses, they must be prepared to advise and admonish with adequate knowledge of local conditions. And, besides all this, they must be protected against the danger of devoting to the importunate claims of their dioceses time that rightly belongs to their own intellectual life. While every effort is being made to encourage systematic study among the clergy, it would be deplorable if our bishops became too much overwhelmed with diocesan business to keep in touch with the development of current theology; and this is the danger from which a bishop of such a diocese as Rochester or Worcester can hardly escape.

The necessity for facing the situation has been staved off for a time by the revival of suffragan bishops, but it is impossible to regard this as more than a makeshift. For the problem of finding adequate stipends for suffragan bishops grows constantly more difficult, and is leading to the same demand for men with 'private means' that has introduced a new form of simony into our parochial patronage system. And, again, what a bishop deposes to his suffragan is necessarily that part of his work, such as confirmations, that is most directly spiritual and that brings him most into contact with the people of his diocese. The diocesan bishop is, in consequence, becoming more and more an administrator rather than a teacher.

That the time is ripe for a forward movement in the creation of new dioceses seems clear, but before embarking on any such scheme one further step is needed to round off the programme initiated by the Bishoprics Act of 1876. At the time when this Act was being prepared Lord Cross, then Home Secretary, offered to include Birmingham among the bishoprics to be sanctioned. Dr. Philpott, then Bishop of Worcester, replied that the idea was premature, and accordingly Birmingham was omitted from the Bill.

This omission probably lost for the great Midland centre its most hopeful opportunity for securing diocesan independence; for it is difficult to believe that, aided by the

general interest then excited in the extension of the episcopate, Birmingham would have failed where Wakefield and Newcastle succeeded. The case for the establishment of a bishopric for Birmingham has grown much stronger since those days, and more than one effort has been made to raise the necessary funds for that purpose. The most noteworthy of these attempts belonged to the last years of the episcopate of Dr. Philpott, and the story of it is worth telling somewhat in detail. In 1889 the dignity of a city was conferred on Birmingham, and soon after, in referring to this fact in his Charge, the Bishop of Worcester expressed his willingness to forward any scheme for providing the new city with a bishop of its own. The general respect felt throughout the diocese for the bishop had prevented any action from being initiated for the division of the diocese till the lead had been given by Dr. Philpott himself; and the reference in his Charge at once awakened a strong interest that manifested itself in letters and articles in the press and in the formation of a local committee to consider the whole question. The time was not wholly auspicious, as a great effort was just being made to raise funds for building a new General Hospital at a cost of over 200,000*l.*, and some of the wealthiest local Churchmen were giving this appeal munificent support. Still, the general feeling that definite action should be taken, and a generous offer by the bishop to surrender 800*l.* of the income of the Worcester diocese to the new See, encouraged the provisional committee, under the energetic guidance of its honorary secretary, Mr. Walter N. Fisher, to set about the drafting of a scheme. Perhaps it would have been wiser to face frankly at the outset the fact that a large capital sum would need to be raised to secure the necessary minimum income. As it was, the correspondence columns of the local press teemed with ingenious schemes for securing the necessary income by acquiring parochial revenues, or in other ways. Ultimately a scheme was formulated for creating a 'Bishopric of Birmingham and Coventry,' to include the whole of the Archdeaconry of Coventry, which had been transferred to the Worcester diocese from Lichfield in 1831, and certain districts transferred from the Archdeaconry of Worcester and from the Diocese

of Lichfield. It was estimated that a capital sum of about 90,000*l.* would be required, in addition to the annual income proposed to be surrendered by the Bishop of Worcester, to secure for the new See the minimum statutory income of 3,000*l.* and that a house would also have to be provided. The scheme was formally launched at a great meeting in the Town Hall on January 21, 1890, with the strong support of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson) and of Canon Westcott. But though the leading Churchmen of Birmingham seemed convinced of the advantages of the proposal, it must be admitted that the scale of donations was inadequate in view of the large amount to be raised—one donation of 3,000*l.* and one of 2,000*l.* being the largest offered.

When the total amount promised had reached 32,000*l.*, and no considerable further increase appeared probable, the committee was obliged to consider what possible alternatives to the original scheme were open to them. It was ultimately suggested that a large part of the endowment of St. Philip's Church, which it was proposed to make the cathedral church of the new diocese, should be allocated to the new bishopric, and negotiations were opened with the trustees of St. Martin's Church, the mother-church of Birmingham, with a view to securing a contribution from the surplus revenues of the trust. The trustees generously offered, on certain conditions, to contribute a sum of 750*l.* a year. These new proposals seemed to bring the new bishopric within measurable distance of realization, as only about 20,000*l.* would require to be raised in addition to the amounts already promised. But strong opposition was expressed, by some of those whose support was indispensable, to the use of parochial revenues for episcopal purposes. In view of the fact that about 7,000*l.* of the income of the see of Worcester was in 1840 annexed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and has since been used in making grants in augmentation of parochial endowments, the validity of this objection does not seem incontestable; but it was recognized that it would be wellnigh impossible to secure the passing of the private bill that would be needed for giving effect to these proposals without the help of Lord Salisbury and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Meanwhile other difficulties arose. The proposal to include Coventry and Warwick in the new diocese was regarded with strong disfavour by the Churchmen of these towns; and the districts that it was proposed to transfer from the Lichfield diocese, while willing to join a Birmingham diocese, were not favourably disposed to a scheme that included them in a diocese that embraced the greater part of Warwickshire. The problem of Coventry was, and remains, difficult. On the one hand, geographical considerations make it *primâ facie* undesirable, while cutting out the Birmingham area, to leave Coventry attached to the Worcester diocese. But on the other hand, though the association of the Coventry archdeaconry with the diocese is only of recent date, there is no strong desire among Churchmen of South Warwickshire for any change in the existing arrangements. The ideal solution would no doubt be found in the establishment of a bishopric for that part of Warwickshire not included in the Birmingham Diocese, with either Coventry or Warwick as the cathedral city, leaving the county of Worcester as the area of the Worcester diocese. But the time is not yet ripe for this change, and any new scheme of division now proposed will no doubt leave Coventry and South Warwickshire attached, for the present, to the see of Worcester.

While this question was under consideration, Bishop Philpott resigned, and the whole scheme was necessarily hung up for a time pending the appointment of a successor. One last evidence of Dr. Philpott's interest in the matter deserves record. When, a little while after his resignation, some difficulty arose with regard to the sum which it was proposed to transfer from the Worcester revenues, Dr. Philpott offered to pay the entire amount of the annual charge that might be laid upon the income of the See during the time that he drew a retiring allowance.

Under Bishop Perowne the difficulties in the way of the division of the Diocese came to a head. Had there been behind the movement a strong momentum of enthusiasm, they might perhaps even then have been surmounted; but while a few Churchmen still clung tenaciously to the hope of achieving success, general apathy had succeeded the short-

lived interest of the previous year. The creation, in 1892, of an Archdeacon of Birmingham and suffragan Bishop of Coventry proved practically the death-blow to the project, and at what Mr. Royle Shore, in his pamphlet, calls a 'panic-stricken meeting' on March 16, 1892, it was decided to return all donations received, and abandon, for the present, all attempt to carry out the scheme. The general committee was requested to continue in existence, and the meeting refused to accept the resignation of the honorary secretary—a fact that enabled Mr. Fisher, some years later, after much legal contest, to secure for the fund a bequest of about 1,500*l.* This remains in the bank as the nucleus of a bishopric fund.

Two efforts to galvanize the scheme once more into life deserve a passing mention. At the time of the Birmingham Church Congress, in 1893, a suggestion was made by the stewards of the congress that a few large donations should be secured, but the only response was a munificent offer of 10,000*l.* from Mr. John Corbet, and one of 5,000*l.* from Lord Beauchamp. Some years after this, Lord Norton, whose keenness no amount of discouragement has been able to daunt, made another attempt to re-start the scheme, but found no response among those whom he sounded on the subject.

Ten years have passed since the collapse of the last definite effort to establish a Birmingham Bishopric, and in these ten years many changes have taken place in Birmingham and in the Diocese. Of the men who were most prominently associated with the original attempt, several have passed to their rest. The list of donors shows that contributions amounting to nearly 12,000*l.* cannot now be claimed from those who originally promised them. But on the other hand the position of the Church in Birmingham has been greatly strengthened. Under the leadership of the present Bishop of Coventry, to whom Birmingham churchmen owe a debt that it would be difficult to exaggerate, the Birmingham Archdeaconry has been organized and welded together, and changes among the incumbents have led to the awakening of vigorous life in several parishes that were formerly inert or disorganized. Meanwhile the overflowing population of

the city has flooded the surrounding districts, so that now the frontiers of Birmingham reach out in all directions towards the boundaries of the archdeaconry. Strenuous efforts have been made to cope with this growth, and the Church has probably gained rather than lost ground in the last decade. But it is perhaps the greatest praise that can be given to the Bishop of Coventry to say that he has made it practically impossible for any other suffragan bishop to succeed him; and while his vigorous and energetic leadership for a time threw the question of the division of the Diocese into the background, it has now become evident that archidiaconal activity has reached its limits, and that no strong forward movement can be hoped for in Birmingham Church life till a resident diocesan bishop can take the lead.

The position of ecclesiastical affairs in Birmingham is in some respects peculiar. A good many years ago bodies of evangelical trustees acquired the patronage of the mother-church of St. Martin and of the old parish church of Aston. Both these churches in their turn control the appointments to their daughter-churches, and in this way the patronage of nearly thirty of the fifty-five churches in Birmingham and Aston is, directly or indirectly, in the hands of two outside bodies of trustees. It cannot be said that this arrangement is one calculated to promote the best interests of the Church, though the trustees of St. Martin's have recently placed Birmingham under a great debt of gratitude by inducing the Rev. John W. Diggle to exchange the pleasant scenery of his Westmoreland archdeaconry for the cares of St. Martin's parish. Most of the daughter-churches are inadequately endowed, and are in consequence obliged to depend largely on pew-rents, often paid by former residents in the parish who, though they still attend these Churches, have moved into the suburbs and left the parishes within the city in the possession chiefly of the poorer classes.

The endowments of St. Martin's include certain leasehold properties in the city which already produce an income of about 5,000*l.*, and are expected ultimately to return nearly four times that amount. When the Bishopric scheme of 1889 collapsed, the trustees promoted an Act of Parliament giving

them the right to use the surplus funds of the trust, after providing an adequate income for the rector of the mother-church, in augmenting the income of the daughter-churches. There is therefore reason to hope that by degrees many of the churches in the poorest parts of Birmingham will be adequately provided for on the financial side.

Partly in consequence of their exiguous income many of the Birmingham churches are inadequately staffed. Some years ago a Commission appointed by the Bishop reported exhaustively on the needs of the Church in Birmingham, and in the opinion of this Committee not less than eighty-two additional clergy were needed for the efficient carrying-on of the work of the Church. Since then some slight increase has taken place, but several of the largest parishes are still very much undermanned.

Birmingham has for long been one of the strongholds of Nonconformity. Some of the causes of this are stated by the Bishop of Coventry in the appendix to the Report of the Commission referred to above :

‘ During the seventeenth century Birmingham became a stronghold of Presbyterianism. It was not a corporate town ; it had few privileges beyond those of a country village. But it was famed for its market and the ingenuity of its manufactures. It naturally attracted to itself those whom the provisions of the Five Mile Act expelled from the corporate towns. In 1672 an indulgence was granted and a room licensed for public worship for Nonconformists. Shortly afterwards, in 1689, the first Dissenting Chapel was erected, known as the “Old Meeting House.” This and the “New Meeting House,” erected in 1692, were Presbyterian Chapels. The first Romish Chapel and the Friends’ first Meeting House were erected in the same century. The government of Birmingham at this time was nothing more than the old Court Leet, elected by the town. The Court Leet in turn elected the Low Bailiff, and, party spirit running high then as now in Birmingham, the Court Leet and its nominees were all Nonconformists, the barren honour of the High Bailiff’s position being left to the Churchmen. By the beginning of the eighteenth century Birmingham was a thoroughly Nonconformist town. The power was in the hands of Nonconformists, and became only more firmly lodged there by sundry ill-advised attempts to wrest it from them.’

The nonconformists still retain much of their former supremacy. The Unitarian body, though not perhaps very numerous, includes in its ranks many of the leaders of the civic life of the city. Among its adherents are numbered some of the wealthiest and most generous citizens; and while responding nobly to the claims of philanthropic and educational efforts, these men can naturally not be expected to help forward the work of the Church. The Society of Friends, nobly led by the Cadbury family, has in its Sunday Adult Schools built up a splendid organization for giving practical expression to Christian brotherhood. And Carr's Lane Chapel, where the Rev. J. H. Jowett is ably carrying on the traditions of Dr. Dale's ministry, is the Mecca of Midland Congregationalism.

On public platforms the relations between churchmen and nonconformists are somewhat strongly antagonistic, but in some cases at least this aggressive attitude of hostility is not found inconsistent with a personal feeling of friendliness. The triennial School Board elections have done incalculable harm in Birmingham in stirring up the worst passions of sectarian bitterness; but the abolition of the *ad hoc* election under the new Bill will probably tend to the growing up of a more friendly feeling towards the Church among those who in the past have been in the forefront of the contest which, after twenty-seven years, ended at last, two years ago, in the return of a Church majority at the last School Board election.

The example of Truro serves to show how much can be done by a resident bishop to clear up misunderstanding and promote friendlier recognition of the Church's work on the part of those who are outside her communion; and if the number of Nonconformists who have helped to swell the congregations at the churches where the Bishop of Worcester has preached in the last few months can be taken as an augury, the new Bishop of Birmingham will receive from many of the leading nonconformists of the city a welcome scarcely less cordial than that which will be offered to him by the churchmen of his Diocese.

The establishment of the new University constitutes a

strong additional reason for pressing on the creation of a Birmingham Bishopric. Under Sir Oliver Lodge's able leadership the University has already developed a vigorous life, and is likely to prove an important centre of higher education for the Midlands. Any attempt to impose an ecclesiastical character on the work of the University would be strongly and justly resented, but a resident Bishop of Birmingham, if he brought with him any educational qualifications, would be sure of a hearty welcome on the governing body. The principle of the University is to give every religious organization 'a fair field and no favour,' and the Cathedral Church, within about two hundred yards of the University buildings, would form the natural centre for the religious life of those students who belong to our Church.

It is worth recording in this connexion that an effort is being made to make Queen's College, which for some years has been in a somewhat moribund condition, an effective centre for the Church work of the Archdeaconry, and also to establish a close connexion between the College and the University. Over this development a Bishop of Birmingham would be able to exercise an effective control.

Birmingham has always shown itself responsive to the influence of great leaders. The names of Miller and Viner, Dawson and Dale, Bright and Chamberlain, bear witness to the spell that a strong personality is able to throw over the men of the Midlands. But since the days of the Priestley riots, in which the churchmanship of Birmingham showed itself in anything but an amiable light, the Church has never taken a conspicuous part in the life of the city. Many signs, however, now appear to indicate that the time is come for her to claim her share in all that makes for social good; and nothing could so well express that claim as the gathering together of the forces of the Church under the leadership of a bishop whose title should bear witness to the fact that Birmingham was his centre and his home.

In view of all these facts, it is clear that delay in the establishment of the Birmingham Bishopric will involve the loss of opportunities impossible to recover. Were the case less pressing, it might be urged that the division of the

Diocese should be included in a general scheme such as must inevitably be taken in hand within a few years. When that time comes, the question of the present minimum income, and the desirability of readjusting the boundaries of dioceses so as to make them correspond with civil boundaries, will need careful consideration. But Birmingham must not wait, for there is no other diocese (except Rochester, which is now being provided for) in which a division is so imperatively needed as in that of Worcester. For it must be remembered that it is not only in the interest of Birmingham that this change is called for. The county of Worcester, excluding that part of it that lies within the Birmingham Archdeaconry, has a population of just over 350,000 and over 200 benefices. Many of these are scattered country parishes, the incumbents of which, cut off from much that stimulates and helps the clergy of the towns, specially need the stimulus and encouragement of an occasional visit from their bishop.

The county of Warwick, excluding that part of it which lies within the Birmingham Archdeaconry, has a population of about 275,000 and contains rather more than 200 benefices.¹ Either of these counties would by itself form no inadequate task for a bishop who wished to keep in real touch with the work of his diocese. The two together certainly afford sufficient scope for the full energies of a vigorous man, and the interests of this part of the Diocese of Worcester must inevitably be sacrificed when, in addition to this charge, the whole of the Archdeaconry of Birmingham, with a population of close on 750,000, is laid upon the same shoulders. The sense of the greatness of the burden found expression in the address of the new Bishop at the Diocesan Conference last autumn.

‘The work required of a Bishop of this Diocese, if it is to be performed with any approach to tolerable adequacy, does seem to me impracticably vast.’

¹ Certain portions of the counties of Warwick and Worcester belonging to other Dioceses are omitted from these estimates. For purposes of comparison it may be useful to remember that in 1891 the Diocese of Hereford had a population of 229,609 and 377 benefices, and the Diocese of Truro a population of 330,766 and 237 benefices.

'A Bishop means a superintendent ; and as such he ought to have a real knowledge of the parishes—in the case of this Diocese (speaking roughly) almost 500 parishes with an average population of nearly 3,000 people. He ought to know the clergy ; the special character and needs of each place ; the efforts that are being made, or that ought to be made, to consolidate or extend the work of the Church ; the exceptional hindrances or failures or scandals ; the more important disputes and controversies ; he ought to attend to the cases where his attention is legitimately claimed, and to those others where it is not claimed or wanted, but is needed. Schemes of all kinds, from the addition of a memorial brass or window to a church, or a case of disputed dilapidations, upwards, to very much more important measures, material and spiritual, require his personal intervention before they can proceed. To a great many of these matters—perhaps to almost all of them—the Bishop, unless he has had a very special training, is entirely strange. He has to learn his business while he is doing it. And the burden, as it has seemed to me, is such as to crush the life and spirit out of a man before he fairly begins. I am not saying this because I wish to complain. I have no wish to shrink from working hard. And a man's responsibility is a limited one—limited, among other things, by the available working hours. But I am saying what I am saying deliberately, for this reason : because I wish to impress upon you, if I can, that it is a bad policy—utterly bad policy—in any church, in any responsible society, to lay so exaggerated a burden upon its chief officer as—unless he is a giant in physical, mental, and spiritual capacity—to make it impossible that the work can be properly done. I do not think that an episcopal system which does not admit of real episcopacy—that is, effectual supervision—is being given a fair chance.'

'And in the case of this Diocese it is necessary—imperatively necessary—that the area of administration should be reduced. A man might well hope to be the Bishop of the area of the Archdeaconry of Worcester. But here a man is called to be the Bishop of three areas, corresponding to the Archdeaconries of Worcester, Coventry, and Birmingham, which are, as you all know, strangely distinct in interests and sympathies. And to be to Birmingham—to take that example only—anything at all like what a Bishop ought to be, according to an ideal of the episcopate, a man should be a citizen and a Churchman of Birmingham, looking at the local Church from Birmingham as a centre, over the area which it in fact dominates. And this a man cannot be unless he lives there.

'There are many things which it would be premature for me

to say. But with the fresh experience full upon me I want to say this one thing. It is, I am convinced, very bad policy on the part of any society to lay upon its chief officer the sort of burden of work which is calculated to crush heart and spirit out of him before he has begun—the burden of a work which he cannot hope to fulfil with any tolerable degree of adequacy—the burden of a work which so crowds up his life with details as to leave him no time nor energy for thinking what the Church or Diocese as a whole needs—to say nothing about the cultivation and enlarging of his own mind—the burden of a work, moreover, which shows every sign of growing as one makes further acquaintance with it. This is the sort of burden not to stimulate, but to overwhelm and to demoralize a man. There is no real reason why it should not be reduced. And it will matter little that one or two individuals should suffer in the process if the Diocese as a whole can be roused to alter the situation.'

If, therefore, help is asked, as it must be, from the Archdeaconries of Worcester and Coventry towards the Birmingham Bishopric Fund, they will only be asked to make more adequate provision for their own spiritual needs. It is necessary to insist on this, because the Birmingham Bishopric scheme has often been treated as though it was promoted solely in the interests of Birmingham. Even as recently as last April the *Coventry Standard*, commenting on the possible renewal of the scheme, gave expression to this view :

'If the new proposal were entertained by Birmingham, and if the new See were to be inclusive only of that city and the immediate neighbourhood, Coventry, of course, would be voiceless in the matter. It would be the business of Birmingham, and not of Coventry.'

It is clear that the division of the Diocese will need, for its successful accomplishment, the cordial co-operation of all in the Diocese who can help, and that it cannot be to the interest of Coventry, any more than of Birmingham, that the Bishop of Worcester should be overwhelmed with a task too great for any man to achieve.

The appointment of the present Bishop of Worcester last spring revived the hopes of Birmingham churchmen, and the stimulating influence of his personality has already done

much to awaken fresh enthusiasm in the diocese. Meanwhile an anonymous offer of 10,000*l.* made through the correspondence columns of the *Times* over the *nom de guerre* of 'Ignotus,' on condition that 100,000*l.* was raised within three years, brought the matter to a practical issue. In reply to this offer the Bishop wrote to the *Times* :

'Will you allow me both to welcome the noble gift offered by "Ignotus" towards the endowment of a Birmingham Bishopric, and at the same time to explain why I desire to wait another year before launching the Bishopric scheme anew? The need for a division of this unmanageable Diocese is, indeed, peremptory, and I have never doubted that Birmingham should have a Bishop. But the causes which brought about the failure of the first attempt to supply this necessity, and the hindrances that would threaten a second, require to be carefully explored. The fresh enterprise must move along the lines of least resistance, for nothing could be more disastrous than to try and fail again. Thus it seemed to me to be the wiser course to announce, as soon as I became Bishop, that I would not touch the subject of the Birmingham Bishopric till next year; and in spite of the stimulating offer of "Ignotus," I think it is better to abide by this resolution. Probably, if we can get the money at all, we can get it in the two years and four months during which his offer would still hold good. Meanwhile, I know of a second contribution from an individual of 10,000*l.* which will be at our command when we make our fresh departure; and the future labour will be materially lightened if other intended benefactions are notified in the interval.'

Since the publication of this letter no further public announcement on the subject has been made, but it is generally understood that the matter has been engaging the careful attention of the Bishop and his advisers, and that substantial progress has been made in the work of clearing away difficulties. The Bishop of Worcester probably knows by this time that Birmingham churchmen are prepared to support with loyalty and energy any proposals for the division of the Diocese that he may lay before them. One thing is certain: the plan of evading financial difficulties by appropriating parochial revenues must be definitely abandoned. As has been already explained, the resources in the hands of the St. Martin's trustees have now been definitely

allocated to the augmentation of the stipends of the incumbents of the daughter-churches, and no help can therefore be looked for from this source. St. Philip's Church has an endowment producing about 1,200*l.* a year, but as this church will become the cathedral church of the new Diocese—a position for which it is peculiarly fitted, both from its splendid position in the heart of the city and from the fact that the Bishop of Worcester is patron of the benefice—it would seem desirable that these revenues should be used to form the nucleus of a fund for providing a cathedral chapter. It might be convenient, for a time at least, that the Bishop should hold the office of dean, as at Truro, and live at St. Philip's Rectory, a large and convenient house in the centre of the city. It is, however, more probable that the Rectory will be retained in the hands of the incumbent, and that a house will be provided for the Bishop in Edgbaston or some other conveniently accessible suburb.

St. Philip's Church, though a very favourable specimen of eighteenth-century classical architecture, should be regarded as the cathedral of the Diocese only until such time as Birmingham shall be able to erect on the same site a pile that shall worthily express the aspirations of her churchmen and the pride of her citizens.

As has been said, no help towards the endowment of the new See can be secured from parochial sources. From the mother-Diocese it would be unreasonable to expect a contribution largely in excess of that offered by Bishop Philpott. When the retiring allowance of the late Bishop is no longer chargeable on the income of the See, a contribution of 1,000*l.* a year might perhaps be forthcoming from this source; but to secure the minimum income of 3,000*l.* and a house a sum not far short of 100,000*l.* must be raised in voluntary contributions. Can this be done? Undoubtedly, if any real enthusiasm is roused among Churchmen. A few years ago a sum of more than twice the amount was raised in Birmingham, largely through the efforts of Sir John Holder for the building of the new General Hospital. But it must be remembered that little help can be expected to the Bishopric Fund from many of the wealthiest citizens of Birmingham,

who are nonconformists. It will therefore be necessary to appeal to churchmen outside the Diocese if the entire amount is to be raised within a reasonable time. The importance of Birmingham as the capital of the Midlands, the home of vigorous municipal activity, and not least as the city that has given to the Church of the nineteenth century three of the noblest of her sons—Lightfoot, Benson, and Westcott—all these constitute a strong ground of appeal. The influence of a keen and energetic diocesan life developed in Birmingham would radiate throughout the Midland counties. The position occupied by Birmingham in relation to the Midlands was clearly stated by the Bishop of Coventry in a paper read at the Worcester Diocesan Conference in 1900 :

‘Birmingham is the workshop and market of the whole Diocese. Hard things, I know, are said of Birmingham, and possibly Birmingham deserves some of them. But Birmingham is bound to exercise every year more influence in the Diocese. The citizens of Birmingham will increasingly build their houses in our country parishes ; Birmingham newspapers will carry Birmingham ideas into rural districts. As the new Birmingham University grows it will powerfully effect the education of the Diocese. You might as well try to keep Birmingham hardware out of your villages and country towns as keep Birmingham life and thought out of the remotest corners of this Diocese. The Diocese will be in the long run what Birmingham makes it. Those who feel disposed to question the statement are requested to remember how largely Birmingham was responsible for the agricultural movement which revolutionized rural life ; and how politically at the present moment Birmingham dominates this and the neighbouring Diocese.’

That a strong diocesan life can be developed in Birmingham none can doubt who knows how keen is the local patriotism of the city when once it is roused into activity.

It has been assumed that the present Archdeaconry of Birmingham will constitute the new Diocese. No other arrangement could wisely be suggested. For in the last ten years there has developed in this area an ‘archidiaconal consciousness’ that would become diocesan without difficulty. The suburbs of Birmingham that are at present in the Lichfield Diocese—Handsworth, Harborne, and Smethwick—

would naturally be attached to the new Diocese, and it is not probable that the Bishop of Lichfield would raise any objection to their transfer in exchange for Dudley or some other district in North Worcestershire. The new Diocese would then have a population of 823,739, and 121 benefices.¹ Of these about forty are country parishes, situated for the most part on the eastern and southern edge of the Archdeaconry; all the rest are practically included in the sphere of influence of greater Birmingham. It is a matter for regret that of these country parishes two only are in the gift of the Bishop, but there is reason to hope that advowsons might be in some cases transferred to him by the private patrons who now hold them. Every part of the Diocese would be easily accessible from the centre, no parish being more than twenty miles from St. Philip's Church.

It will necessarily be two or three years at least before the Bishopric can become an accomplished fact, and it is therefore premature to discuss any personal questions connected with the new Diocese. Indeed, it is important that the question of the Birmingham Bishopric should be considered apart from all such personal considerations. Those on whom will fall, in due course, the task of selecting a bishop may be trusted to realize that the man they appoint must be above all things a man to whom God has given the spirit of power and love and discipline.

Speaking in the Birmingham Town Hall more than ten years ago, Archbishop Benson pictured the kind of man needed for the work of the new Diocese:

'You must have a devoted man. I could name many a great name, but to speak for a moment just of the name of a man who worked exactly in the same sort of way, and whose work is before you all: you want a devoted man here like Fraser. And then if he himself comes and works among you, he must do so with proper appliances. He must be fully furnished for his work.'

'You want to place among yourselves a citizen—a real citizen,

	Population	Parishes
¹ Birmingham Archdeaconry	739,628	111
Handsworth, Harborne, and Smethwick	84,111	10
Total	823,739	121

with the interests of the city, and the love of the city, and the passion for the city at his heart. You want to place here a servant of God, to whom God is all in all. You want a prophet—I say advisedly a prophet—a man who can speak true and plain things to both rich and poor. Everywhere you see that God's message to the world must be conveyed by men who live amongst, and who know, the people to whom they speak. And, last of all, he is to be not only a citizen and a servant of God and a prophet—he is to be a humble disciple of Jesus Christ. You want a man who sees and knows things as they are—no vain shadows, no dreams ; but men as they are, and God in so far as it has pleased God to reveal Himself to man. That is the sort of man that you want to make this a strong centre. And if you are in earnest in forming such a centre, and if you are in earnest in praying God to send you the man, He will reward your earnestness by sending him.'

For the moment, as has been explained, the matter is in abeyance as far as any public effort is concerned. It is, however, generally understood that considerable progress has been made in the shaping of a definite scheme, and that within the next few weeks encouraging information on the subject may be forthcoming.

The Diocese has learnt from previous failures that it will be no easy task to raise the amount needed to secure the income necessary for the new See: but a new wave of enthusiasm is, we hope, coming over the Diocese ; the *esprit de corps* of a great city must be aroused ; local churchmen must learn to give with self-sacrifice and self-denial ; and the whole Church must recognize that the matter concerns the Church as a whole. For the whole body suffers from a weakness in any one of its members. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Birmingham churchmen for the way in which they have, under very difficult circumstances, fought the battle of religious education, and we may well repay them some of the debt—if it is needed. But Birmingham churchmen will not desire to be relieved of the need for a definite and united effort towards an object which will bring so large and permanent gain to the Church life of the city.

In Memoriam

FREDERIC, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

JOHN WOGAN, BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS.

WILLIAM RICHARD WOOD STEPHENS, DEAN OF
WINCHESTER.

THE last fortnight of 1902 brought a great loss to the Church of England. The death of the Archbishop of Canterbury has deprived the country of one of its great men. The death of the Bishop of St. Albans has removed one of the most capable diocesan bishops. By the singularly unfortunate death of the Dean of Winchester an able Church historian is taken away.

It did not seem right to give our readers a too hasty review of the life of the late Archbishop, but we must not allow this issue to close without some few words of respect for his memory.

His last public appearance, his last speech in the House of Lords, was typical of his whole career. It was remarkable for the earnest appeal that he made for the Education Bill, still more perhaps for the nature of that appeal. He supported it earnestly, not only as a measure of fairness for voluntary schools, but also and still more earnestly as a great scheme for the improvement of National Education. His criticism was equally two-sided. If he asked for something more for voluntary schools, he also wanted much more for Secondary Education. This two-sidedness sums up his whole career. At the Founders' Commemorations of our English colleges and schools we are accustomed to hear the words incorporated in our prayers 'that true religion and sound learning may for ever flourish.' These words, expressive of the best traditions of English Churchmanship, might well form the motto for the life of the late Archbishop. His zeal for education was only equalled by his zeal for genuine and true religion. In his long and varied career he had been a tutor of a great Oxford college, the headmaster of a training school for teachers, the headmaster of a great public school; he had largely assisted in organizing our National Education in its earlier stages. As a Bishop and Archbishop of the Church he had in thirty-three years won the respect and admiration of all those sections of the Church which had most vehemently opposed his appointment, and had shown himself always the defender of genuine religion.

If we were to define his position we believe that we should be
VOL. LV.—NO. CX. G G

right in describing him as essentially a true son of the Church of England. It is a type which finds its complete religious satisfaction in the normal traditions and services of the Church, which is absolutely steadfast in its loyalty, genuine and real in its piety, undemonstrative and reticent about feelings. It is widely tolerant towards all parties, for it belongs to none. A contemporary of the Oxford movement, the one great idea which he seems to have learnt from it was the conception of the Church as a great world-reaching religious society. It appealed to his instincts as a statesman, and was broadened and strengthened by a wise liberalism. He never wished to narrow the limits of the Church of England, nor to lose any elements of genuine piety or real religious life. He was willing to acquiesce in much for which he had little sympathy, for he had experienced misrepresentation and intolerance himself, and to all alike he would be absolutely just. His answer to Leo XIII., which he had studied, we are assured, with the greatest care, is the fullest vindication of the position of the Church of England which has received official sanction.

As Bishop, and again as Archbishop, it is his unremitting toil which stands out conspicuously. It may be true to say that the toil was too great; that there was loss, sometimes perhaps great loss; that a broad and able mind did not leave itself free to deal with great principles. But there are times when the stress is so great and the demand so urgent that steady, unrelenting work is the one thing needful. So we do not doubt the late Archbishop judged the situation, first in London, then in the Church at large. The struggle against evil in every form was too instant to be slackened for even a moment. To this struggle he devoted himself ungrudgingly with all his great strength both of mind and body, working as few others could ever work, setting a splendid example of steady self-devotion.

But greater than his policy, greater than his work, was his own self. It was by what he was, even more than by what he did, or perhaps by what he was because of what he did, that he won men's admiration and gained their adherence. He was listened to not for any great gifts of eloquence nor for skill in speech, but for his character, for his strength, for his simplicity, for his genuineness, for his manliness. It was this that made him so great a speaker at Church congresses to working men, it was this that made men always feel that if he gave his approval and support to any cause there was nothing unreal or artificial about it. It was this that, penetrating through an exterior which might not have been attractive, made him always a commanding influence, and won men's affection.

The Bishop of St. Albans was one of the best of the diocesan bishops. First curate, then vicar in large London parishes, a model parish priest, he was called to a position which he had never sought, and which his modesty would have made him decline. He devoted the remainder of his life to one of the hardest and most difficult of dioceses, and without any great gifts of intellect or speech, by untiring devotion, by simple earnestness, by clear-headed business capacity, and by kind geniality he won himself an honourable place among English bishops and great affection among his clergy. But how long is our anomalous system going to allow overgrown dioceses to wear out the strength of our best men?

The Dean of Winchester was not in the front rank of scholars, but he was an able and capable historian. We have ourselves to thank him for courtesy and help, and to regret that he has been taken away before the completion of an able series of histories of which he was joint editor and a contributor.

Each in their different spheres had worked very loyally for the Church, and our prayer must be that others in their generation may work as ably,

Et quasi cursores vitæ lampada tradant.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—THEOLOGY, PRACTICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

The Personal Life of the Clergy. By ARTHUR W. ROBINSON, B.D.
(London : Longmans, 1902.)

THIS little book, which serves as a prologue to a series of handbooks on clerical studies and duties, deals with the formation of the character without which studies and work will be in vain. Its tone of sanctified common-sense will commend it to many who might be repelled by the high asceticism of Liddon's *Priest in his Inner Life*, or bewildered by the richness of Canon Newbolt's *Speculum Sacerdotum*. It is a further merit that it does not touch upon matter of dispute among Churchmen, so that it may be read without repugnance by almost every man who seeks or holds the sacred commission.

Mr. Robinson begins by showing that the desire for ministerial success, though easily perverted by selfish ambition, is in itself natural and right. He who would lead souls to Christ may well

desire to see the fruit of his labours ; and ' it is pathetic to witness the attempts which are made to imitate the efforts and to reproduce the effects of others ' who exercise an influence for good upon their flocks (p. 5). Such influence must be gained not by organization, nor by schemes of work, nor by imitation of others, but by living in close communion with God. The work must have ' wheels,' indeed, but what is wanted is the ' Spirit within the wheels.' This spirit is the gift of God, but it needs on our part careful development. Mr. Robinson is misleading when he defines grace as ' an infinite power of taking pains ' (p. 27), for grace is God's gift, and pains are man's response to it—neither sufficient without the other, but in combination never fruitless ; though for a time endeavour may seem to result in mere total failure, just because the self-consciousness which is inseparable from effort obscures the power of grace (p. 30). We should have welcomed a few words here on God's frequent trial of the patience of His servants by an apparent refusal of success.

First, the priest must take pains in penitence, the lack of which is the sandy foundation on which many a fair house is built only to fall. The scanty conviction of sin is partly traced to the prevalent tendency to regard God as the Educator of the world rather than its moral Governor ; and of this tendency the evolutionism which tinges all our thought is one of the causes (p. 43) ; but the mischief is more surely traced to our habits of haste. We have no time to linger on our knees when there is so long a journey for our feet to perform. The age, intolerant of pain, is eager for ' religion without tears.' We should remind ourselves, that we may teach our people, that the one true test of character is whether we correspond, not to a standard of conduct established by ourselves, but to the purpose for which God created us (p. 48).

Next comes the need of taking pains in prayer. We believe that Mr. Robinson is right in thinking that scientific objections to prayer are not one of the chief causes of difficulty in this respect, for the difficulty is felt in all classes, even where scientific objections are hardly known. A more common cause is found in that haste for quick results of which we have already spoken. The answer to prayer cometh not with observation (pp. 57-76).

A third need, yet the chief, is devotion to our Lord, which can only be learned by the study of His life in the Gospels, for which no book, however excellent, can be a substitute (p. 94).

Having pointed out these positive needs, Mr. Robinson proceeds to warn his readers against three prevalent evils—Secularization, Over-occupation, and Depression. How many zealous priests need

to be reminded that their 'main concern after all is not the rearrangement of the secular order,' but the salvation of souls! How many, again, should remember that something more is needed for the solution of economical problems than a hearty sympathy with the poor! If a Bishop Westcott could adjust a strife between capital and labour, it does not follow that the zealous young curate can do the same; and ignorant dogmatism on such subjects is more likely to irritate than to persuade. We welcome some wise advice on the social life of the clergy (p. 119). A man's religion must be a weak thing if it is endangered by an occasional dinner-party; and the young man who abstains from social intercourse with cultivated people not only loses many opportunities of helping others, but also robs himself of culture which may be most useful. Entirely do we endorse the warning against over-occupation (p. 130)—endless services, classes, meetings, and, too probably, bazaars and treats, which leave no time for prayer and study and thought, or for a quiet discussion of difficulties with perplexed souls. Two excellent maxims are quoted: the one from Lord Acton, that 'mastery is acquired by resolved limitation'; the other from Dr. Pusey—'Limit your work.'

Lastly, Mr. Robinson gives good advice about depression. As it often arises from physical causes, he rightly urges reasonable care of health, and especially the reservation of one day's rest in the week for those whose Sunday is necessarily a day of toil. 'You need a Sabbath as much as the rest of us,' was the wise remark to us of a Scottish doctor. But above all, the sovereign cure for depression is habitual trust in God. Mr. Robinson quotes a noble passage from F. W. Robertson, but we regret that he does not refer to the wonderful essay on *Accidie* of the Bishop of Oxford.

There are other subjects on which we would gladly receive Mr. Robinson's wise advice—the secular and theological studies of the clergy, the duty of basing moral teaching upon dogmatic truth, the need of keeping the spirit fresh in spite of constant dealing with divine things, and pure in spite of necessary familiarity with sin. If in another edition he sees fit to add a few pages on these topics we shall be grateful; but we are grateful already for a little book which will be of service to many priests, young and old. We need more priests, and such a book may well increase their number by explaining the nature of the life to which a vocation to Holy Orders calls men; but we need still more that priests should realise the life to which they are called and pledged: and this they can hardly fail to do if they listen to Mr. Robinson's prudent and tender counsels.

Prayer. By the Rev. A. J. WORLEDGE, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro. ('The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.') (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.)

THE practice of prayer may perhaps have been as much neglected by the careless and indifferent in other ages as it is to-day, but probably never before have really devout and religiously minded people been so tried by intellectual difficulties as to the theory and efficacy of prayer—difficulties physical, philosophical, and moral. When once these difficulties are felt they must be faced, and some solution of them must be found, or prayer—however fervent—loses that kindling power of faith without which it inevitably fails to attain its real end. Something has been done, no doubt, by the many manuals for private use which have been compiled or newly published in recent years, and by sermons and other writings on the subject; but there was room and to spare for a work of moderate compass which should 'supply some guidance and instruction in the principles, conditions, and subject-matter of prayer,' not only to educated laymen and women, but also to the clergy themselves, and should at the same time weigh the difficulties to which we have referred, and indicate the lines of reasoning which show that they are not really inconsistent with belief in the efficacy of prayer.

We, therefore, heartily welcome Canon Worledge's attempt to fill this gap in our theological literature—an attempt in which he has certainly achieved a large measure of success. We could not wish a better expression of the principles and possibilities of prayer, or a more sympathetic treatment of the problems connected with it. He fairly and fully states and meets the difficulties. He takes a wide and comprehensive view of the subject, and seems to deal happily and convincingly with all its branches. The tone of the whole book is scholarly and devout, and every page reveals in its wealth of illustration the width of the author's reading and preparation.

Besides more general considerations, such as the subjects proper for prayer and the spheres and conditions of effectual prayer, there are excellent statements of the principles of prayer to distinct Persons in the Godhead, of the meaning of prayer in Christ's *name*, of the action of the Holy Spirit in prayer, and of prayer for the faithful departed. Of the many passages which we should like to quote, we must content ourselves with one on the need of uniting personal prayer with the prayer of the whole body:

'We are not to confine our thoughts here merely to personal prayer. The personal prayer must be linked, as, indeed, the Lord's Own Prayer

is a perpetual reminder, to the prayers of the Church and its Sacramental acts. To learn, in increasing measure, thus to unite personal prayer with the prayer of the whole body, is to experience in yet higher measure the power which finds expression whenever we say "through Jesus Christ our Lord." As the Head, in His glorified Manhood, of the Church, He offers the prayers of His people, and in Him each member is linked with the whole Body. And the unselfishness, trained in a conscious sense of Church membership, breaks through the barrier which, in our own lives, hinders the manifestation and operation of that power, and so brings dishonour on our Lord' (p. 106).

There are many other words to take to heart, e.g. those on the need of self-denial as an accompaniment of all true devotion and prayer—self-denial that does not stop at literal 'fasting,' but extends to the control of the higher intellectual and aesthetic, and even spiritual, pleasures (pp. 152, 297). And we can heartily endorse what is said in regard to family prayer (pp. 258, 259, e.g., 'The attendance of some members of a family at week-day services cannot be pleaded as an excuse for the omission of prayer in the household') and on prayer as a duty as well as a means of personal edification (p. 291). Indeed, in conclusion, we would emphasize this point. Far too often we hear the complaint, 'It doesn't do me any good,' 'I don't feel any better for it'; and the failure to experience personal edification is held to justify neglect of the practice. To counteract this dangerous tendency, we need the recognition of the fact that prayer and public worship are a *duty* owed to God—and we may say to man as well. And the more the aim of personal benefit and gain is kept in the background, the less there is of conscious striving after merely personal edification, the more likely in many a case is prayer to achieve its highest ends. As true in this sphere as in any are the words *Date, et dabitur*.

The Ministry of Conversion. By ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Canterbury. 'Handbooks for the Clergy.' Edited by the Rev. A. W. Robinson, B.D. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.)

WE are heartily glad that Dr. Mason has been persuaded to publish these addresses, after letting them lie by for ten years since they were delivered. They are full of that high kind of common sense and pastoral zeal which is always needed, but by no means always to be had when wanted most. The young priest who is beginning his work will do well to submit himself to Dr. Mason's guidance. He will be shown the possibilities of service which lie before him, and the principles and methods by following which he may hope to avoid

mistakes and to realize something of his aims. And older workers will find much that is helpful and stimulating for fresh effort.

As the title indicates, it is particularly mission work—the conversion of the unconverted, home and parochial mission work—that is in view. But it is certain that every parish priest in his ordinary daily round has ‘mission’ work to do, and every preacher needs to remember that there will certainly be in his congregation some who are not really converted. ‘It is well to recognize that both classes (*i.e.* converted and unconverted) may be represented in the congregation, and not always to take it for granted that they need nothing more than an interesting instruction or a quiet meditation.’ All who have to preach may lay to heart this warning: ‘Many of our sermons fail of effect because we do not ourselves know what we wish them to effect, or to what part of our audience we wish the different portions of the sermon to apply’ (pp. 43, 44). So Dr. Mason really addresses himself to others than those whose chief work is the *prédication de conquête* in its narrower sense. He vindicates the term ‘conversion,’ and claims it in its full and proper meaning, and shows the need of the work. He states admirably the relation between baptism and conversion (p. 10), insisting that the former is no substitute for the latter—the one is a spiritual endowment, the other a matter of the will. It is not safe to assume that the spiritual and moral attitude is necessarily changed when the status is changed—though Dr. Mason wisely warns us that it is a change of progress and development that is to be looked for in most cases. After enlarging on the opportunities of the work, he goes on to deal with the methods to be employed—how to produce conviction and how to deal with newly awakened souls. All through, his counsels are ardent and yet sober, and they are salted with the salt of humour and what is clearly personal experience, though the personal note is only an undertone. If we select for special appreciation what is said of the place of confession in this ministry, it is only because we could wish that the subject was always handled as wisely; and if the younger clergy will steep themselves in this chapter they will know how to deal with the matter so that their efficiency may be the greatest and their ministry most helpful. Equally sound and convincing is what is said of the value of a body of priests free from parochial and family ties. There is no doubt that the experience of the last ten years has further proved the truth of the principles which are expressed.

Altogether this little book is one for the younger clergy to read and read again. We have marked many passages which we should

like to quote, but we strongly recommend them to turn to the book itself.

The Corn of Heaven. By HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D.
(London, 1901.)

TWENTY years ago or thereabouts many of us can remember hailing with pleasure the issue of several volumes, in their olive-green bindings, by the same author as the one with this title. *Bible Teachings in Nature*—which, we see, has reached its fifteenth, as *Two Worlds are Ours* has its third, edition—and other collections of similar addresses were models of their kind. The beauty and excellence of style and matter in those entitled *The Teaching of the Earth*, *The Permanence of the Past*, *The Autumn Fire*, to mention only a few out of many, remain still fresh in our mind, and we often refresh our memory of them by re-perusal. The old charm has not deserted Dr. Macmillan. His hand retains its cunning. The vein has still something to repay its working, though, by so repeatedly being drawn upon, it has naturally become somewhat thinner. Perhaps, however, the appearance of this is due to the fact that these addresses, as their author tells us in his Preface, 'were meant in the first instance for young people of a thoughtful and inquiring turn of mind.' They are shorter and of a more simple and homely character than Dr. Macmillan's earlier writings. But there is the same keen appreciation of and insight into the beautiful and marvellous sights and scenes of the outer world; there is the same power to trace the varied teachings of Nature, the same dexterity in their application. For instance, after describing the banyan or sacred Indian fig-tree, which

'Loves to bend its arms
Downwards again to that dear earth
From which the life that fills and warms
Its grateful being first had birth,'

he thus presses home the lesson it suggests :

'I should like each of you to be planted in the house of the Lord, at the same time that you are still growing under the pious influence of your own home. You thrive well at present, no doubt, as branches in the parent trunk, supported by the religious life of your home and taught by others. But you must remember that you are supported on the religious life of your parents and of your teachers, nourished by the good influences of your home and church and school, in order that you may grow strong enough and wise enough, like the banyan-tree and the yew-tree I have spoken of, to send down roots of your own to the ground, and draw up from the spiritual soil force and life for your own growth.

If you have a root of your own, while you continue as a branch in the parent tree you will flourish exceedingly' (chap. ii.)

Not less felicitous is the skill with which he enlists in the service of religious truth the experiences and recreations of his boyhood in tapping the plane-trees for their sap in early spring, and the similar tasting of the maple sugar in the woods of America.

'In the spring of your life, then, taste and see for yourself that the Lord is good. Tap, as it were, the tree of life that grows in the midst of your garden, the tree whose fruit will satisfy all your wants, and whose leaves will heal all your troubles; tap it when its sap is richly flowing for you, and from that sap you will drink with joy the sweetest cup that life has to offer' (chap. iii.).

Our space does not admit of copious extracts, but open the book where we will, we come upon vivid descriptions of things going on every day around us in the world of Nature, and fresh light is constantly thrown on spiritual phenomena by deeper insight into and reflection upon what hitherto we had not sufficiently observed.

Under the Dome. By the Right Rev. A. F. W. INGRAM, D.D., Bishop of London. (London: Wells Gardner, 1902.)

THE manifold needs and longings of ordinary folk were in the mind of Dr. Ingram when he preached at St. Paul's on Sunday afternoons, and again on special occasions he showed that he understood what was wanted by judges, doctors, soldiers, temperance workers, missionaries, and others. In this little volume which marks the turn of his life as a Canon of St. Paul's, the Bishop has given some samples of such sermons, so far as he has been able to turn the reports of what was spoken extempore into readable chapters.

Christ the Indweller. By the Rev. J. T. JACOB. (London and New York: Macmillan, 1902.)

In this thoughtful little book the doctrine of the inward Christ is considered in its practical bearing upon the details of ordinary life. The writer was for some time an assistant diocesan missionary in the diocese of Exeter, and, although he is chiefly occupied with the relation of the individual to God, he neither forgets nor ignores the important conception of the Church as a living organism. The truth which he desires to emphasize, gains in force when it is thus considered in relation to other truths, and the result is a book which should be very serviceable in the promotion of personal religion.

Words of Faith and Hope. By the late BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham. (London: Macmillan, 1902.) 4s. 6d.

THIS volume forms an acceptable close to Bishop Westcott's writings. 'Dear as Sacramental wine to dying lips is all he said.'

Some of the thirteen addresses here given have already been published; but we are glad to see them brought together, nor need we resent the occasional reiteration that occurs, *e.g.* the constant enforcement of favourite ideas and maxims, that 'the true unit of society is the family and not the man,' or the repeated illustration of phases in Church history from the characters of Antony and Benedict and Francis, the hermit, the monk, and the mendicant.

On many features of our age Bishop Westcott lays a sure finger.

'There is materially the prevalence of luxury; intellectually the predominance of dispersive study; spiritually, the practical assertion of individualism in regard to the highest destinies of man; an aggressive individualism and a material standard of success.'

'There never was a time when men have had a keener sense of what religion ought to be and to do. There never was a time when the demands upon religion were greater.'

'Times devoted to quiet contemplation are set down to indolence. Commerce, trade, industry are organized in terms of war. Education is looked upon as a means for private advancement, and art as a spring of private wealth.'

Many pregnant sentences occur, such as, 'We look to the past, not for authoritative precedents, for examples of human discipline'; 'The home is the hearth of the national life, the most effective training-place of the next generation.'

The last six of these addresses were delivered within the last three years. Perhaps the most characteristic are No. 6 and No. 11. In the former the Bishop, when proposing at Newcastle the resolution that 'Labour Co-operation is in full consonance with the highest principles of ethics and religion, and is not less favourable to the material interest of the State,' affirms, with much eloquence and keen insight into our times, the principle of co-partnership in labour.

'Durham and Northumberland have done very much in the past towards establishing cordial relations between employer and employed.' How much of this result is due to the earnest, unflagging efforts of the Bishop! Durham and Northumberland are still redolent of his devoted episcopate; and they will welcome as a precious legacy his latest public utterance given in this volume,

which was delivered at the annual service of the miners in Durham Cathedral, July 20, 1901.

Very touching is this *cycnea vox*, this unconscious prophecy :

'At the present time Durham offers to the world the highest type of industrial concord which has yet been fashioned. . . . While then so far I look back, not without thankfulness, and look forward with confident hope, I cannot but desire more keenly that our moral and spiritual improvement should advance no less surely than our material improvement. And therefore since it is not likely that I shall ever address you here again, I have sought to tell you what I have found in a long and laborious life to be the most prevailing power to sustain right endeavour, however imperfectly I have yielded myself to it ; even the love of Christ : to tell you what I know to be the secret of a noble life, even glad obedience to His will.'

Human Life a Revelation of the Divine. By C. H. ROBINSON, M.A.
(London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.)

THIS is a volume of somewhat miscellaneous 'studies,' written in a very cultured and pleasing style, and bearing ample evidence of thoughtful observation and wide experience. The first part consists of a fresh series of studies on the character of Christ, the most useful chapters in our opinion being those in which certain difficulties or objections 'arising out of the Gospel portrait of Christ' are stated and discussed. Typical specimens of Mr. Robinson's style and method are the passage in which he explains 'None is good save one, even God,' and that which deals with certain aspects of the Atonement (ch. vii.). There is nothing specially striking in part i., and at times the treatment appears slight ; but the general line of the discussion is, from the point of view of apologetics, both useful and suggestive.

We are inclined to rate more highly the second part of the volume, which deals with the Old Testament, and pleads that the surest proof of its Divine origin is to be found in the revelation it contains of God and of human nature. These excellent chapters would, if printed separately, form a valuable and interesting little book. Mr. Robinson's general attitude towards criticism may be gathered from the following passage :

'If modern criticism can make the Old Testament more intelligible by re-arranging its component parts, and by showing that the development of its teaching has been in accord with God's revelation of Himself in Nature, *i.e.* with the principles of natural evolution, such criticism will have conferred a double benefit upon all who are prepared to accept its conclusions. It will not only have furnished a new argument for the reality of the inspiration of the Old Testament but will at the same

time have established the most real connection between its teaching and the needs and wants of the present.'

In touching on the subject of our Lord's references to the Old Testament narratives, the writer adopts the line of treatment usually associated with the name of Bishop Gore. He thinks that the evidence points to a certain self-imposed limitation of Christ's human knowledge—a 'temporary limitation of all knowledge' which was not essential to the carrying-out of the work of man's redemption. A particularly useful chapter is that which sketches 'the results of Old Testament Criticism,' which are stated 'in order to show how little these results really affect the question of inspiration.' Mr. Robinson expressly disclaims any intention of offering an opinion as to the credibility of these results; but he believes—rightly, as we think—that should these results (*i.e.* those regarded by most students as 'assured') be completely established, 'the Divine origin of the Old Testament would be rendered more certain and obvious than is even now the case.'

The third part of the volume is headed 'Studies in Worship,' and considers in some detail the objects of worship as stated in the Exhortation prefixed to the morning and evening services in the Prayer Book. There is nothing that calls for special remark in these addresses. It is perhaps strange that there should be so little reference to the Holy Eucharist—a point which has evidently struck the writer himself. On the whole Mr. Robinson's book is a well-executed and careful, if not very original, piece of work, and thoughtful readers will find it stimulating as well as enjoyable.

The God of the Frail. By THOMAS G. SELBY. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.)

THIS volume of sermons is not easy reading. It is evidently the outcome of wide and varied reading and diligent thought, but we miss the strength and simplicity of style that are characteristic of a really great preacher. Mr. Selby is too often vaguely rhetorical, and looks at religious truth almost exclusively in its intellectual aspects. The fifteenth sermon on 'Blindness and Insight,' which is headed 'For the Young,' painfully illustrates the preacher's total inability to be simple, and we cannot even imagine what effect its ponderous sentences and abstract modes of expression can have produced on youthful hearers. On the whole we should select two sermons in particular as really favourable specimens of Mr. Selby's manner—that on 'The Inspired Creed,' and the discourse on 'The Peril of Degeneration,' which deals in a very serious and thoughtful vein with certain disquieting symptoms of social and moral decadence, which

are visible enough to careful observers. The waning influence of Christianity is thus described by Mr. Selby:

'The saints, for some strange reason, seem to have become a negligible quantity. The dominant politician treats the Church as an influential Prime Minister treated an honoured ecclesiastic when he went to ask for Temperance reform, bowing with profound respect, and dismissing the proposal with silent contempt. The public-house is politically and economically stronger than it has been for the last half-century, betting and gambling were never so rife in certain sections of society as now, and larger numbers than ever are alienated from the Churches, without being dogmatically atheistic or formally anti-Christian. . . No thoughtful man can watch without misgiving the secondary place now given in the councils of the State to moral and religious principles, and this distressing apathy is not characteristic of one political party more than another.'

If Mr. Selby would cultivate a greater directness and simplicity of style, he might himself perhaps become one of the 'passionate prophets' whom England, as he thinks, so urgently needs. His earnestness of moral conviction is beyond dispute. But an excessive intellectualism, we venture to think, robs his discourses of the force that acts most powerfully on the average heart and conscience.

A Book of Common Worship. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, the Knickerbocker Press, 1900.)

It appears that this work, 'prepared under direction of the New York State Conference of Religion by a committee on the possibilities of common worship,' is a result of the National Congress of Religion, 'which itself was the child of the Parliament of Religions held in connexion with the World's Fair in Chicago in the year 1893' (p. v). An invitation to the Church of England, conveyed through Archbishop Benson, to attend that assemblage, met with a courteous but firm refusal. If that refusal needed any further justification, the contents of this volume, which (p. ix) appears to have been prepared in 'haste for a special need,' amply supply it. 'Scripture Readings' on universality in religion, ethical and spiritual religion, and religion in society and the State, are taken from 'Jewish and Christian Scriptures,' including several from the Mishna, and from 'Ethnic Scriptures' (Hindu, Persian, Chinese, Egyptian, Buddhist, Grecian, Roman, and Mohammedan). 'The one eternal, invisible, infinite, and incomprehensible Deity,' who, as in Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, is to be addressed in 'Common Worship,' is thus described now as personal (in a reading from St. John iv.), now as impersonal (in extracts from the *Khandogya-Upanishad*, pp. 94-98); now we read of

the 'true Light' (St. John i.), now of one who says, 'this deluded world knows not Me unborn and inexhaustible . . . Me nobody knows' (p. 104). On the basis of these discordant 'readings' there follow 'collects of universality,' 'of ethical and spiritual religion,' 'of society and the State,' together with doxologies and benedictions. 'No further liberties,' we are told, 'have been taken with any of these prayers than was necessary for the purpose of this manual. For obvious reasons the formula in latter times closing many Christian collects has been omitted' (p. viii). 'Hymns' follow under similar classifications, in some of which words such as 'The King of love my shepherd is,' must, in the assemblies for which they are designed, be emptied of all meaning. Poems to 'O Beautiful, my country,' and 'My country ! 'tis of thee' (pp. 391-3), apparently the United States, close the collection. In a speech in which reference was made to the 'Parliament of Religions,' Archbishop Benson said :

'The Church is like the old temple. There is the court of the Gentiles ; there is the court of the women into which the ordinary worshippers are admitted ; there is the court of the priests ; there is even the holy place ; but I do not think that we could go to any such assembly and leave our Holy of Holies behind us ; still less could we imagine that its veil could be drawn aside.'¹

The publication of this manual may, perhaps, serve one useful purpose if it should indicate to some earnest Christian people, who advocate 'undenominationalism' or 'interdenominationalism,' what the logical conclusion of both is likely to be.

God the Beautiful. An Artist's Creed. By E. P. B. (London : P. Wellby, 1901.)

THIS little book reminds us curiously of the late Professor Max Müller's *Deutsche Liebe*, which it resembles closely in two particulars : the words are the words of the dead, and, as in *Deutsche Liebe*, the author endeavours to give a sketch of the philosophy of life which shed a light on his path through the valley of the shadow of death.

The book consists of a series of letters addressed by a young Danish artist, while he lay dying of consumption at Leith, to a chance visitor who made a brief stay at the same hotel. The visitor was keenly interested in the invalid, who spoke English well, and had imbibed from an English tutor a strong love for poetry and art, his favourite poet being Keats, to whom he felt specially drawn, partly

¹ *Life*, ii. 683.

by the pathos of his career, partly 'by his subtle sense of melody, his delicacy of thought and expression, as well as by the general atmosphere of his poetry.' The writer's philosophy may be described as a kind of pantheistic idealism. He finds a manifestation of 'God the Beautiful' in Nature, in the soul of man, in all acts of human love and courage. Nominally a Lutheran in religious creed, the writer seems to find no special significance in the revelation of God in Christ. His system cannot accordingly be described as Christian pantheism. In spite, however, of the obvious limitations of his thought, the book contains many suggestive, original, and beautiful thoughts. 'Future theology,' he thinks, 'will grow out of the doctrine of the Beauty of God. The new faith will be more orthodox than the old, because it does fuller justice to the essence of the Divine character of love and beauty; it will also insist upon [the truth] that humanity in its essence is Divine, that love pure and ever-flowing is at the heart of the universe.' It is strange that the writer's Lutheran training should have left so slight an impress on his thought. He found rest in a vague and optimistic system which has points of contact with religion, but is not in the strict sense of the term religious. The conception of God as Father, which we owe to Jesus Christ, is, he says, 'only a partial one, suited to a certain stage of human civilization'; he finds in the idea of a kind of mystical union or fusion of the soul with God 'the central truth around which the nobler faith will revolve.'

Carmina Mariana. Second Series. An English Anthology in Verse in honour of and in relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and arranged by ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A., Editor of *Annus Sanctus: Hymns of the Church for the Ecclesiastical Year*. Second Edition. (London and New York: Sold for the Editor by Burns and Oates, Limited, 1902.) Price 7s. 6d.

THE first series of *Carmina Mariana* appeared in 1893.¹ Mr. Orby Shipley has now published a collection of verses selected in much the same way. Like the first series, it contains some poems of great merit and many which are marked by poverty of thought and expression. As in the first series, also, a certain number of verses are included of which it cannot be thought that any allusion to the Blessed Virgin was in the mind of the writer. In spite of the imperfections which necessarily belong to a large collection of verses made on the principle which Mr. Shipley has adopted, the book will be useful to students of literature of this type, and parts of it will have very considerable devotional value for those who are able to

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1893, p. 518.

accept the theological conceptions underlying most of the verses. The very large number of authors from whose works selections have been made includes such different writers as Adam of St. Victor, Mr. Alfred Austin, Chaucer, F. W. Faber, Mr. Alfred Gurney, Mrs. Hamilton King, Mrs. Meynell, Cardinal Newman, Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson, Christina Rossetti, Spenser, and Wyatt. Among the poems new to us, the translations and imitations by the Rev. G. R. Woodward show much taste and skill; and there are two charming verses by 'Mary E. Mannix,' entitled 'In a Country Churchyard on "Memorial Day," U.S.A.' The book has its uses; as a whole it breathes an enervating air. As the copy sent to us is the 'second edition,' it may be well to say that the 'first edition' was privately printed.

Thoughts on the Penitential Psalms. By ETHEL ROMANES, Author of *The Life and Letters of George John Romanes*. With a Preface by the Rev. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's. (London: Rivingtons, 1902.)

The universal language of Holy Scripture must, says Canon Holland's preface, break itself up for use into our several tongues. 'It must multiply its echoes.' But the echoes must be genuine, witnessing their source, leading the mind up to use for itself the great original utterance.

The book is not unworthy of its noble preface. The writer brings an understanding use of entirely good teachers, brings the more costly preparation of real experience to the service of the many who would read with growing apprehension the great Psalms of Repentance. Suffering, Penitence, Christ, these are the steps of Revelation made clear in every page of the book; welcomed suffering, permanent penitence, a faith in Christ proved in daily use. The sorrow we read of as a foreign mischance, a landslip in China, a prison in history, comes home presently and is our own. Shall it be recognized as sacred and accepted for healing, or shrunk from to become the poison fear pictures it? The Psalms are to train us to the right sorrow, to the penitence as deep for each as the greatest saint's penitence, to the faith in Christ which is as real to-day, as powerful for eternal life as it was in the first man who heard His voice. Of these great realities Mrs. Romanes writes with a real knowledge, a real humility, with genuine profit for those who read the Psalms with her.

Les Règles et le Gouvernement de l'Ordo de Penitentia au XIII^e Siècle. Par le R. P. PIERRE MANDONNET, O.P. Première Partie (1212-1234). (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1902.)

WORK goes on apace at the early records of the Franciscan Order, and every few months throws fresh light upon points which have hitherto been in doubt. Especially is this the case, at the present moment, with the ancient rule of the Third Order of St. Francis, recently discovered and edited by M. Paul Sabatier. This was described in an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1902, the writer of which endorsed the opinion of M. Sabatier, that the rule was composed at a period very shortly after the death of St. Francis, but that it had received a few additions subsequently. On the other hand, Dr. W. Goetz, of Munich, who examines the document at length in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (vol. xxiii. 1902), comes to the conclusion that it is a mere mosaic of comparatively late date, which incorporates early fragments of unknown origin. It has now been studied with the greatest thoroughness by the learned Dominican of Fribourg, who had already done so much for the study of Franciscan origins. Père Mandonnet argues that the title of the *Memoriale* in the manuscript found by M. Sabatier should be read: 'The Memorial of what is undertaken by the Brethren and Sisters of Penitence who live in their own homes, first made in the year 1221. In the time of the lord pope Gregory IX. it was as follows': the meaning being that the *Memoriale* was first composed in 1221, and subsequently revised, and that the text is given as it stands in 1228. The argument itself is of no little cogency; but it is clinched by his discovery of a description of a manuscript containing the *Memoriale* in its earlier form, containing only twelve chapters instead of thirteen, and with no reference in the title to Gregory IX. or the year 1228. The description is contained in the catalogue made by Père Berardelli of the Library of SS. Giovanni e Paolo at Venice, portions of which he published in the *Nuova Raccolta d' Opuscoli scientifici e filologici* for 1782; and although Père Mandonnet has been unable to find this manuscript in the Library of St. Mark at Venice (to which the greater part of the Library of St. Giovanni e Paolo was transferred), the description is so clear and precise as to place its character beyond doubt. Thus it would seem to be established that the *Memoriale* was first composed in 1221. The fact remains, however, that it differs *in toto* from the compositions of St. Francis; and this being so, it must be regarded, not as one of the latest of his writings, but as one of the earliest of those writings, of which the rule of 1223 for the whole Order is another example, which derive their origin mainly from Cardinal Ugolino.

Some of Père Mandonnet's other conclusions would seem to be much more dubious than this; but as his study of the origins and early history of the Third Order is still incomplete, they need not at present be further noticed here.

The Mirror of Perfection: being a Record by Saint Francis of Assisi, ascribed to his Companion, Brother Leo of Assisi, and now translated by CONSTANCE, COUNTESS DE LA WARR. (London: Burns and Oates, 1902.)

THIS is a new translation of the *Speculum Perfectionis*. A preface by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., apparently accepts the view, which is ascribed to 'the majority of critics,' that 'it is of a late date, probably of the beginning of the fourteenth century'; but it shows no signs of an appreciation on the part of the writer of the nature of the evidence on the subject. Any reasonably good translation of the *Speculum* is to be welcomed, and this may fairly be so described, but it is not likely to take the place of the much better and more scholarly version made by Dr. Sebastian Evans a year or two ago.

The Lady Poverty. Translated by M. CARMICHAEL.
(London: John Murray, 1902.)

FRANCISCAN studies are now being actively pursued, and this little thirteenth-century allegory seems to have found four editors within the last ten years, though Mr. Carmichael's is the first English translation. It is a very pleasing little treatise, breathing the happy spirit of the early Franciscans, who found in the careless outdoor life of the mendicant friar, in close contact with the sights and sounds of nature, a full compensation for the luxuries and comforts which they had renounced. The book is very daintily printed and bound.

II.—CONTROVERSIAL THEOLOGY.

Mother Church and her Antagonists. An Account of her Continuity and the Origin of Dissent, with an Answer to some Modern Charges. By L. J. JAMES, M.A. (London: Simpkin Marshall. Carmarthen: Spurrell. No date.)

THIS vigorous controversial handbook is full of information, which parochial visitation in Glamorganshire has shown to be much wanted. Mr. James began by publishing a pamphlet on the origin of the Church, her ministry, and her Reformation changes. A thousand copies were quickly sold, and the author has now enlarged it and included it in the present book. Another part of the volume deals with the origin and principles of the sects. This also has already met with a ready sale in booklet form, and supplies handy materials

for those who have not read Curteis or Hammond, or do not possess *The Denominational Reason Why*. The remainder of the book is an examination of some charges laid against the Church by Dr. Rees in his *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales*. Mr. James meets the common charge that the Church persecuted the forefathers of the dissenters by the *tu quoque* method, and in such books as Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy* he finds abundant matter for his purpose. We cannot recommend any more wholesome line of historical instruction to Churchmen than to urge them to make known as widely as possible what the condition of religion in England and Wales was during the Great Rebellion, when the Church was disestablished and disendowed, and earnest Puritanism had full scope for the exercise of its own sweet way. Addresses to a guild or a class on the real state of affairs, locally or biographically described, and driven well home by the use of such illustrations as Mr. James supplies, are sadly needed to dispel prevailing ignorance in general society about the history of the Church of England, and, we must mournfully add, to nail many false statements about her to the counter, as well as to correct the insufficient narrative of many current histories. Mr. James gives a good list of 'works consulted,' and an index, but no table of contents. If he hits hard we must remember that he is in the midst of aggressive Welsh dissent, and at all events is able to fight with clearly defined issues. He quotes some language used of the Church of England in Wales and of her clergy from the Welsh press, which shows the temper which has to be faced better than any comment upon it:

'Their hypocritical prayers are nothing better than blight-breeding curses, and the "Church family" is no blessing to any, for they are soddened with deceit and shame. These lazy dogs of the Church are unable to preach, move, or work. They are blind teachers, soft-brained and dumb, slow bellies and beastly. Their mission is wantonness and oppression, and their visits are accompanied with nothing better than the fierce breathings of hell' (p. 254).

This will provide the dissenting historians of a few hundred years to come with a useful stick to beat the dog.

Our Attitude towards English Roman Catholics and the Papal Court. By the Rev. A. GALTON. (London: Elliot Stock, 1902.)

WE are not sure how many different series are being edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D. But in spite of having so many irons in the fire he is remarkably successful in maintaining a high level of excellence in the work which he gets out of his numerous con-

tributors. The present volume is one of a series called 'The Church's Outlook for the Twentieth Century,' which Mr. Burn, as editor, describes as a series of instructive handbooks on current ecclesiastical problems. The series is intended to deal with matters of primary importance to such as are interested in the Anglican communion in a sympathetic and broad-minded way, while each writer has been left free to speak frankly about his own convictions. A strong list of contributors has been issued, and Mr. Galton's book is the second of the series which has appeared. Although now domestic chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon, he was formerly himself a Roman Catholic, and he writes therefore with some knowledge of the Roman system from within, and at the same time without the tone of controversial bitterness which is too often heard in the utterances of the pervert or the convert. The general scheme of the series is that in each case, as far as is practicable, the subject in hand is introduced by a short historical sketch, indicating the course of development to the stage at present reached, with the addition of suggestions upon future progress. Mr. Galton's book interprets this method very freely, for it is not, as its title might suggest to some readers, mainly devoted to our present attitude towards Roman Catholics, but to the tracing of the history of the relations which have existed in the past between Rome and England, or, in Mr. Galton's own words, an account of the relations between England and the Papacy from the seventh century until our own time. The attitude of a patriotic Englishman towards his Roman Catholic fellow citizens and the rulers of their Church is described in conclusion in the light of this account. Mr. Galton looks at his subject politically rather than theologically, and yet in the final chapter, which is altogether too slight and thin, he makes no reference to the matter of the King's Declaration, which has such an important bearing upon the citizenship of Roman Catholic subjects. After chapters on the Patriarchates in general and the Roman Patriarch in particular, Mr. Galton deals with British and Celtic Christianity. But we are not satisfied that he is entirely clear about the matter. He will not accept the current theory about the relation of abbots and bishops in Celtic Christianity, but he does not put any other theory in its place. He rather alarms us by talking about later mediæval theories of Orders, without expressly saying that episcopacy is an essential part of Church polity. And he thinks that it is going much too far to say that England owes its Christianity and Church to Rome, without a frank confession of the historical position which we have often carefully elaborated in these pages, that St. Augustine, and no other man, was the planter of the English Church. The narrative

is continued in this thin and vague way through Norman, Mediaeval, Reformation, and Stuart times, necessarily slight it may be, but vexatiously avoiding clear statements on important points in too many cases. However, in these chapters, and in the sketch of the later papacy, Mr. Galton leaves no reader in doubt that past history makes any full reconciliation between the average Englishman and the Roman Catholic system a political impossibility, and in that conclusion, fortified as it might be by many sound doctrinal arguments, which do not come within the compass of Mr. Galton's little attempt, we heartily agree with him.

Vision and Authority, or the Throne of St. Peter. By JOHN OMAN, M.A., B.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.)

We know that Mr. Oman's starting-point is indicated by his second title, because he kindly tells us so. By his own map of the course we are also indebted to him for the information that his book treats of the subject of internal and external authority, the creed and organization of the Church. After more than one attempt to master the subject-matter of Mr. Oman's inquiry, we confess that we have turned gratefully to the guidance of the table of contents to find out what we have been reading about. Mr. Oman himself fears that the first three chapters may prove a stumbling-block to some readers, but our opinion is that a reader must possess exceptional ability and patience to get on with any part of the work. And we cannot say that we advise any one to go through so much to get so little. Mr. Oman wants to urge that the supreme task of the Church must be to ask once more after reality, to uncover her foundations, to ask upon what Divine word her authority rests, to review her assertions in the light of her intellectual attitude, to establish some agreement between her ecclesiastical confidence and her theological uncertainty, and more to the same effect. But the Church can at least say what she means in very clear and concise formularies of faith—the Nicene Creed is, after all, not so long as Dr. Oman's book, and certainly not so cloudy—and few members of the Church of England will recognize the truth and justice of Mr. Oman's attempt to sketch 'pure Canterbury.'

The Church's Outlook. Theology Old and New. By WILLIAM FREDERICK COBB, D.D., Rector of St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate. (London: Elliot Stock, 1902.)

THIS work, although small in compass, covers so wide an area that in a short notice it seems impossible to attempt much more than indicate its general character. It forms one of a series edited by the

Rev. J. H. Burn, in which problems of primary importance 'to such as take an intelligent interest in the welfare of the Anglican communion' are to be treated 'in a sympathetic and broad-minded spirit, which may help to bring about a better understanding among church people who hold divergent views on ecclesiastical affairs' (p. v). The 'ecclesiastical affairs' discussed in this little volume of 176 pages are nothing less than 'the leading features of the theology which Christian bodies have either come to hold, or are preparing themselves to accept' (p. vii). If we thought that 'the theology of the twentieth century' (p. 13) in the Anglican communion were likely to be reduced to the *minimum* suggested in Dr. Cobb's well-meaning work, we should be unable to agree with his anticipation that 'the result will be to assure timid or anxious believers that the religion of Jesus Christ has nothing whatever to fear or to surrender when brought face to face with the forces of modern thought' (p. vii). The coming theologian, we are told (p. 59), 'will treat the creed as a vague approximation to the general moral sense of the community, and as its protection against intrusion on the part of alien spiritual forces.' 'Revelation, to us to-day, has ceased to have to do with externals in any shape whatever, at any rate in the first instance. No dogma, no institution, no bare historical fact of itself is primarily the subject of Revelation' (p. 67). We are not surprised to discover, a little later on, that 'opinions may differ as to whether . . . the Fourth Gospel be written by the beloved disciple, or contain memoirs of his, or be a second-century unhistorical document' (p. 82). Passing to the doctrine of the Incarnation, we learn that 'it is false theology, to say nothing of bad tactics, to stake the truth of the Incarnation on the Virgin-Birth' (p. 89). Dr. Cobb would apparently 'insist on the belief only "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," leaving members of the Church free to hold this or that conception of the *how* God was in Christ' (p. 90). So far as we can follow Dr. Cobb (pp. 94-5), he would appear to hold, in language which seems influenced by Ritschlian theories, that our Lord is divine only in a degree far higher than man is divine. 'Every child of man is an imperfect incarnation of the divine, a being possessing the Holy Spirit in some degree. Jesus was God giving Himself without stint to the world, using a perfect human instrument as the vehicle of His self-revelation, showing all of Himself that can be shown to beings such as we are. God gave not His spirit by measure unto Jesus Christ, and, therefore, he who has seen Him has seen the Father' (p. 95). In the conception of the Atonement there will, in the twentieth-century theology, be only 'the sight of the Divine love' in the self-sacrifice

OMAN,

)

second
course
treats
and orga-
nizer the
we have
find out
that the
readers,
ility and
cannot say
le. Mr.
must be
s, to ask
assertions
agreement
certainty,
say what
the Nicene
tainly not
will recog-
tch 'pure

WILLIAM
Bishops-

area that
more than
ited by the

of Christ, 'which breaks the power of selfishness, *i.e.* of sin, within us' (p. 110). 'Expiation and propitiation' are 'lower and outworn theories' (p. 111). After ascribing the Epistle to the Ephesians to 'one of St. Paul's school' (p. 117), the writer expresses his opinion that the 'Catholic' view of the Church is 'doomed,' and the 'Protestant' view is the one which will survive (p. 120). He considers it 'as proved beyond all controversy that Christ left no official ministry of any kind at all' (p. 122), while sacraments 'are not to be placed in the first rank as means of salvation' (p. 138). In the section on 'the doctrine of the Last Things' we are told that St. Paul 'will not look to the Life of Jesus for moral inspiration, to His death for evidence that God has been reconciled, and to His Resurrection for proof that we shall rise again' (p. 153). The Apostle, in fact, 'places a low estimate on them as mere incidents in a physical Life' (*ibid.*) We do not doubt that the writer of this book is sincere in the conviction that his teaching can be reconciled with that of the Anglo-Catholic Church, and that the ethical power of Christianity can be best secured by throwing overboard the teaching of the undivided Church, in which the faith, once for all delivered to the saints, was formulated. But those who agree with him may (to use Dr. Bright's words, *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, p. xiii) 'profit by the invitation to consider whether the ethical power would have been, or would now be, what it has been and what it is, apart from a belief in a Divine Christ, and in what He has done, and is doing, for His disciples, servants, worshippers,' in the sense in which the Catholic Church from Apostolic times has maintained it.

The Catholic Church from Within. With Preface by the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.)

THIS work which, as we learn from an advertisement in a list of theological books bound up with it, is from the pen of Lady Lovat, has the distinction of a preface by Cardinal Vaughan. It has been written, the Cardinal tells us, partly for 'any who care to inquire what ordinary Catholics of the world, well-educated in their religion, and familiar with the ways of what is called society, have to say on the inner life of Catholics' (p. v). 'The outsider, therefore, may feel pretty confident, when he has gone through the book, that he has penetrated into a Catholic home of the educated class—and this without the trouble of introductions, and subjection to the many inane formalities of society in a strange house' (p. vi). The class, however, for which the book 'seems to have been principally

written' are 'converts to the Catholic faith,' of whom a number 'find themselves shy and self-conscious, as foreigners in a strange land.' But 'to many an old Catholic the book should be of equal value' (p. viii). The cardinal notes especially an instructive chapter, largely based on the *Liturgical Year* of Dom Guéranger (p. 182), on the liturgy, of 'the beauty, variety, and meaning of which little is known, even among old Catholics.' 'English Catholics have been so accustomed to content themselves with the great master-ideas and facts connected with the divine sacrifice, that they have too often allowed all the rest to pass unheeded' (p. ix). We are glad to find that in the body of this work considerable attention is paid, not only to the liturgical Gospels and Epistles, but also to the appointed scriptures and psalms in the Divine Office. In this connexion an observation (p. 303) is noteworthy: 'When so many devotional works are brought out, as they are in the present day, some no doubt excellent, but others of a light, not to say trashy, description, it seems a pity Catholics should not seek their devotion and learning at the fountain-head—that is, from the early saints, whose piety was as deep and enlightened as their lives were glorious.'

The tone of the book is at once intelligent and devout. Although there is much, especially devotion to St. Joseph, with which English churchmen cannot sympathize, we should be glad to believe that in the homes of many Roman Catholics in this country the spirit which animates this volume widely prevailed. 'For whatsoever reason,' the author says, 'a man seeks the shelter of the Church's fold, the result must be the same if he is to find peace in it. He must allow divine grace to do its work in his soul, so that Jesus Christ may be formed anew in it, and, as St. Paul says, he may grow up "to the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ"' (p. xvii). Nor is Lady Lovat less anxious about the culture of the intellect: 'Christianity can never come into collision with scientific truth. Both are alike divine. Hence Christianity fears no scientific discovery, or proof, for she regards natural science as the handmaid and ally of religious science. It is only when hypothesis is substituted for proof that religion protests' (p. 298). 'What cause it would be for regret if, even in this country, where we are few in number, Catholics allowed the Church to be ousted from the position she has always held in the van of true progress and enlightenment!' (p. 304). Passages such as these indicate, we hope, the prevalence of a temper able to hold in check tendencies of a very different kind which may produce a widespread reaction not only against distinctively Roman doctrines, but against supernatural religion altogether.

There is in this book a spirit of supreme devotion to our Lord,

which, with some real spiritual insight, permeates the chapter (p. 163) on Holy Communion. To be a frequent and prepared communicant is evidently the writer's own practice, and, in the *immediate* preparation, we note the statement (p. 174) that 'to many the Gospels supply an unfailing source of devotion, and suggestive points for meditation.' 'The thoughts and affections which arise spontaneously in the heart from contemplating the words and actions of our Divine Redeemer are generally more productive of fruit and holy unction, even when the soul is suffering from the trial of aridity, than any which rise from human compositions, however holy and edifying' (*ibid.*). Yet such devotion is enfeebled by appeals to the Blessed Virgin and, even more emphatically, to St. Joseph. After reception of Holy Communion, 'turning to His ever-blessed Mother, we may ask her to take Him up in her arms as she did on that first great Christmas night, and offer Him for us, and with us, a perfect oblation to His Eternal Father for all our needs and for those of all the Church of God' (p. 178). In a quotation from St. Teresa (p. 246) we are told that 'our Lord would have us understand that as He was Himself subject to St. Joseph on earth, . . . so now in heaven He performs all his petitions.' It is, however, satisfactory to observe that, to the question put in regard to miracles, 'as they exist in the present day in the Church,' 'Is it necessary for *me* to believe all these devout marvels?' the author is able to reply, in terms similar to those employed, in the *Grammar of Assent*, by Cardinal Newman, respecting the liquefaction of St. Pantaleon's blood (p. 201), 'The answer which the Church makes is most decisively in the negative. . . . What the Catholic Church does, however, insist upon is the explicit belief that miracles were not restricted to Apostolic times' (p. 349).

Some fear is expressed that when once 'within the Catholic Church' the convert may experience a process of 'disillusionment' (p. 318). In Rome, for instance, he may notice, in the course of 'the usual procession of Pope and cardinals,' that the monsignori and prelates talk and nod to each other; one takes snuff, another stops to chat.' On comparing ceremonial at St. Peter's in Rome and St. Paul's in London, he may think that, in the latter, 'at least, was true reverence.' If, however, the convert will take 'the nearest Catholic' into his confidence, he will, we are assured, go away 'with a much fairer view of the situation.' The 'good monsignori' having each one said his mass, made his meditation, and recited the greater part of the divine office, regard a procession in St. Peter's 'as much of a relaxation as any that he had time for in the day' (p. 314). We quote this amusing explanation, not for its own sake alone, but

because it seems to suggest that a zealous Romanist imagines that a function at noon in St. Paul's or at Westminster Abbey is the first act of prayer offered by Anglican dignitaries in the day, and hence their consciousness 'of the solemnity of the occasion and the dignity of the scene' (p. 314). We can imagine that misconceptions such as these may be used, in certain circles, with effect against us.

For some remarkable statements suggested by a few patristic quotations on the parallel between Eve and the Mother of our Lord in Newman's *Essay on Development* (pp. 384-7), on the very early date of an expression of devotions to St. Mary in 'St. Irenaeus, St. Justin, Origen, and others in the earliest centuries of the Church's existence' (p. 322), 'the universal tradition' of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, which has 'been the common sentiment of the faithful' (p. 272), or the existence of the devotion to 'the Sacred Heart since the earliest ages' (p. 264), the author is, perhaps, hardly responsible. But it would be well if all who, like herself, sincerely desire to promote the divine glory in the salvation of mankind would consider the inevitable result on souls in quest of truth, when the real historic facts in regard to such subjects are presented to them.

Complaint is made (p. 287) in terms which, we think, are exaggerated, on opposition experienced '*in this country*' by converts, fortified by a quotation from 'Hare, (Anglican) Bishop of Chichester.' Whatever may have been the case sixty years ago, when Archdeacon Hare was alive, we doubt the accuracy of the statement now. But it is a mistake to suppose that the hostility of the Roman Church towards the Anglo-Catholic has diminished, although its expression may differ, and, in not a few instances, a breach in family relations or in friendship is due, not to those who stay, but to those who go. Few people who have not experienced it, perhaps, realize the extent of the separation which in matters of deepest spiritual interest takes place, and there are cases in which a secession involves friends of the seceder in heavy pecuniary expenses for his maintenance. It is, perhaps, not wholly surprising that, under such circumstances, the old relations can hardly be maintained.

We have noticed this volume, in the spirit of 'kindly acceptance' which Cardinal Vaughan (p. ix) augurs for it, at some length, because we think it worthy of the attention of those of the clergy and educated laity who may have to deal with persons in the higher ranks of society who are disposed to join the Roman communion. It indicates some of the more powerful sources of attraction, and enables the reader to see where an impartial judgment and sympathetic insight, and a devout and kindly heart, will do more to prevent secession than any amount of argument. We cannot, either,

view without concern a disintegration of belief, due to most extravagant demands on faith, which is, we fear, growing at an alarming rate within the Latin Church. In parts of this book we think that there are traces of a more enlightened and reverent spirit, which, if developed by those who sympathize with the author, may do something to arrest the progress of doubt and unbelief, fraught with gravest consequences not only to the Roman Communion, but to the whole of Western Christendom.

A Course of Religious Instruction for Catholic Youth. By the Rev. JOHN GERARD, S.J. (London: Burns and Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, 1901.)

THIS book contains a course of instruction originally prepared for the boys of the upper classes at Stonyhurst College, 'containing a plain statement of the Catholic position and teaching, and a sufficient *modicum* of instruction regarding them' (p. vi). The first part of the work on *The Truths of Reason* contains a summary of the proofs by which faith in the existence of God is strengthened and His attributes are inferred. The 'proofs' are put in their true position, and the author wisely reminds his pupils that 'we know God, especially through conscience, far more surely than we can by any formal proof' (p. 12). In the section on 'creation,' we note with interest the statement that 'there is nothing to forbid Christians holding the view that our species has been developed from another by natural laws, provided it be granted that the original creation came from God, and that He ordained the laws and implanted the forces by which subsequent development was worked out' (pp. 17, 18). Following Cardinal Newman's argument in the *Grammar of Assent*, Father Gerard argues from the Church, known and recognized as a corporate body, to Christ as its founder to prove His divinity, and then develops the truth of His claims from His character (pp. 33 ff.). All this part of the book, together with the section on faith as concerning 'the whole man' (p. 46), and the moral element in it, would, if enlarged by a teacher, be useful in any school. Nor does the writer in any way shrink (pp. 51, 52) from a right application of the higher criticism, in regard to further studies, in which he suggests the use of writings of Dr. Salmon and Dr. Wace. Teachers in schools other than Roman Catholic would do well to offer instruction on lines such as those sketched in this book. Of the second and third parts of the volume, the larger part is occupied by a series of arguments intended to establish, from various points of view, the contention 'that the Catholic Church in communion with, and subject to, the See of Rome, and this

alone, is that instituted by Jesus Christ' (p. 53). The treatment of the Anglo-Catholic position is, as usual, characterized by the use of sentences of individual bishops and priests, torn from their context, such as a remark of Archbishop Tait (p. 69), Dr. Arnold (p. 176), and Cranmer (*ibid.*). To our authoritative documents he wisely makes little reference beyond a remark that 'different portions of the official liturgy of the Church of England contradict one another, e.g. the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-book' (p. 70). We regret to observe that in a loose quotation from St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.*, c. 4, the usual interpolations are boldly given, although even these are inaccurately translated. The Stonyhurst student would be surprised to learn that 'He who deserts the See of Peter, does he think that he is in the Church?' represents 'Qui Ecclesiae renititur et resistit [*qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata est Ecclesia deserit,*] in Ecclesia se esse confidit?' (p. 98). It is hardly needful to say that the bracketed words have been proved to be a bold interpolation (see, for instance, Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, pp. 200-221, and 544-552). The usual assertions as 'to the legate of the Holy See presiding at Nicaea' and Ephesus (p. 102), and the declaration of the Council of Sardica (of which the date is wrongly given as A.D. 347) that the Roman See is 'the supreme court of appeal,' are made in the ordinary way (p. 102). On the assumption of the genuineness of the Sardican canons, an appellate jurisdiction which, in fact, was of a strictly limited description, carried by the fathers of the Council in favour of the Roman see, would hardly correspond to the view laid down by the Vatican Council. Father Gerard indicates 'very briefly' historical difficulties alleged as 'being incompatible with the supremacy, or at any rate with the infallibility, of the Pope' (p. 111). Despite the admissions of Hefele¹ that Liberius 'renounced the formula *ἡμονούσιος*' and 'accepted the third Sirmian confession,' and 'renounced the letter of the Nicene faith,' Father Gerard thinks that 'the facts are doubtful' (p. 112), although constrained to allow that Liberius 'caused great scandal.' In dealing with Vigilius he omits all mention of the action of the North African Church (A.D. 550), and the relation of the fifth Ecumenical Council (A.D. 553) towards that Pontiff. As to Honorius, whose condemnation he allows (p. 112), 'all that is needful is to understand the history.' Although Leo II. (A.D. 683) spoke of his predecessor's 'attempt to subvert the faith by a profane betrayal,'² Father Gerard thinks it probable that

¹ *Hist. of the Councils of the Church*, ii. 235, 246, 246.

² Coleti, vii. 1156, quoted by F. W. Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, p. 307.

'Honorius was blameless in the whole transaction. . . . Others, no doubt, had a keener scent than he to detect 'the beginnings of error, but such acumen is not amongst the gifts which a Pope is required to possess' (p. 113). Not less is the confidence displayed in the assertion that prayers for the dead in the ancient liturgies prove the doctrine of purgatory, in its Roman form, on which, however, the author very lightly touches (p. 138). We observe with pleasure the observation (p. 155) that 'Christ is the One Mediator. The Blessed Virgin and the saints are not, therefore, true mediators. They mediate only by prayer, and *through Christ*,' although the author is mistaken in his supposition that 'invocation of the saints . . . has been practised in the Church from the earliest times, as is constantly witnessed in the ancient liturgies' (p. 155). That such invocations appear in the existing texts of liturgies is doubtless true, but whether they always stood there, as, for instance, in the *oratio super oblata* for St. Leo's day in the Roman missal, or in a general intercession in the Malabar Liturgy, is quite another question.¹ The author deals with the subject of Holy Orders (pp. 166, 176 ff.) with hardly a reference to the Anglican Ordinal, which in itself would be the answer to most of his arguments. In a list of books contained in the Appendix we are glad to observe that Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* and Bishop Harvey Goodwin's *Religion and Science* find a place.

III.—ARCHÆOLOGY.

Orient oder Rom. Beiträge zur Geschichte der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Kunst. By JOSEF STRZYGOWSKI. (Leipzig: J. C. Henrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1901.)

THE question of the influence of Rome is of but little less importance in archæology than in theology. By the accident of her continuous life, Rome has gradually acquired a position in theology which has tended to obscure her real barrenness; the strength of her lasting power has given her an ecclesiastical empire that has destroyed all sense of proportion in those who come near her, and has perverted their whole historical sense. So also the fact that Rome has been an accessible treasure-house of antiquity has given her an importance in archæology that has made men forget to sift the question of the origin of that which she has preserved, and before speaking of Roman art we should be quite certain that our examples were originally produced there and have not merely drifted thither.

Till lately two theories of the origin of Christian art have divided

¹ See Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, pp. 425-6.

the field, the one connected with the name of Professor F. X. Kraus, the other put forward by Professor Wickhoff. Both agree in assigning an important rôle to Rome in its development, while they differ as to the particular stage at which her influence made itself felt.

Kraus, in his *History of Christian Art*, holds that it was in the fourth and fifth centuries that Rome stamped Christian art with her peculiar character. He considers that ecclesiastical art grew up practically independent of Pagan art. It had its rise, he maintains, in Alexandria in the third century, and passed thence to Rome, where it received a form that dominated the West far into the Middle Ages.

Wickhoff, on the other hand, draws no distinction between Christian and Pagan art. In his introduction to his edition of the Vienna Genesis, he contends that an art independent of Greece arose in Egypt in the first century B.C., from whence it spread to Rome, who made it her own, and perfected it at the time of her fullest expansion of empire in the second century A.D. From Rome it flowed as an 'imperial art' back to the East, and formed the early Christian schools of Alexandria, Antioch, and, last of all, Byzantium, which in turn became the source of the Mediæval art of the West.

Kraus holds that Rome first received and then gave, Wickhoff that she first gave and then received back from the East; but both of these positions are challenged by Professor Josef Strzygowski in his last work *Orient oder Rom*, in which he gives the grounds on which he supports the claim of the East to dispute the significance of Rome as the dominant influence either in the first three centuries or in later times. He contends that Rome has always been ready to receive, but has never had the power of producing.

He gives little disproof of Kraus's claims for the later influence of Rome, which can be traced pretty certainly as at any rate one element in the rather eclectic art of the Court of Karl the Great, and which undoubtedly marked the Benedictine school of fresco painting at Reichenau in the time of the later Frankish empire; he confines himself mainly to disputing Wickhoff's position as to the originality and influence of the work of Rome.

He points out that in his treatise on Roman art, published as an introduction to the Vienna Genesis, there are two fatal flaws. He has not started by asking, 'What is the origin of the manuscript which plays so important a part in his theory?' but 'How did Roman art develop, and how did it influence all other art?' assuming the truth of the theory he seeks to prove; and in the second place his chief authority that serves to introduce his whole theory of Roman art is a Greek document the text of which has close affinities with the Codex

Alexandrinus, and which Strzygowski justly complains he has not compared with other Greek manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Wickhoff considers that the characteristic features of Roman art are its 'continuous style' and its 'illusionist technique.' By the former he means the using of art to present a sequence of events, as on the pillars of Trajan and of Marcus Aurelius at Rome, and by the latter the impressionist method that uses colour masses rather than lines, as did Velasquez and Rembrandt, with whose work he compares that of the best Roman artists.

These two main positions Strzygowski contests. The columns at Rome, which are taken as the chief examples, he points out are balanced by two at Byzantium, while the 'continuous style,' though unknown at Greco-Roman Pompeii and absent from the Catacombs, and the undoubtedly Latin Virgil at the Vatican, was already common in the Greek friezes. The 'illusionist technique' he declares to be the mark of the best period of any art, and notices that while illustrations in Latin manuscripts are usually drawn, those in Greek are painted.

His own position of the greater importance of Oriental art he supports by proofs drawn from various quarters of the East; from a recently opened tomb in Palmyra, the paintings of which he adduces to show that certain Hellenistic types passed directly to Byzantium and not *via* Rome; from an Egyptian wood-carving and a relief from Asia Minor, to show that the late imperial sculpture of the sarcophagus of Helena in the Vatican was borrowed directly from the East. His fourth chapter treats of the little-studied question of fragments of stuffs from Egypt, and the need of a more thorough study of such Oriental objects in our museums 'before writing books of general history of development of art;' while in his last the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem gives occasion to trace the growth of early Christian architecture. This, he says, owed its origin to Hellenistic art in Syria, which borrowed the art of vaulting from Mesopotamia, pillars from Egypt, and the gable from Greece, and had its regular development up to the great dome of St. Sophia, while the Roman basilica whose characteristic features are the feeling of massiveness and sense of space only worked itself out into the unity of the Gothic cathedral several centuries later. The whole is elaborated with patient thoroughness and care. There is, no doubt, danger in relying on conclusions drawn from examples of your own choosing, but no one could be more aware of it than the author, and there is no sign of hurry or prejudged opinion, though the latter must have been hard to avoid.

For in studying the question we are struck with the similarity of

the conclusions arrived at in Christian archæology to the known facts of the course of ecclesiastical history. Wickhoff's theory that Roman art had its rise with the Empire and from thence ruled the world has a remarkable similarity to that of the Petrine claims of government, and seems equally based on ignoring the East. The fact that Roman art did survive and have a great development in the Frankish Empire, as Kraus proves in his *History*, is paralleled by the real power of the Papacy in the one direction in which it proved fertile.

Again, the new light that is being thrown on the Byzantine question in Christian archæology has followed closely upon similar work in the field of Byzantine literature, which has shown that the sixth and seventh centuries represent a decadent form, and not a new period, just at the time when Wickhoff considers Greece was being so strongly influenced by Rome. On the other hand, Strzygowski's theory that Christian art had a simultaneous development in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, and then in Byzantium, and that thence it flowed to Rome, where much was preserved and little developed, has obvious parallels in the course of theology, and commends itself to our belief. At any rate, without prejudging any point by *a priori* assumptions, nothing but good can come from the comparative study of archæology, political and doctrinal history.

Christian Art and Archaeology, being a Handbook to the Monuments of the Early Church. By WALTER LOWRIE, M.A., late Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies at Rome. (London: Macmillan, 1901.)

THIS work, which forms one of a series of Handbooks of Archæology and Antiquities, is a model of its kind, into which is compressed in the brief space of 430 pages a great deal of information on the various forms of Christian Art and Archæology during the first six centuries. The writer is well versed in all the literature bearing on the numerous branches of his subject, and has presented the results of recent research in a succinct form and in a lucid and interesting manner. After an introduction dealing with the relation of Christian to Classical Art and the monuments and literary sources available, the writer opens with perhaps the most fascinating portion of his theme, the Christian Catacombs. The popular idea that these were 'illicit excavations, unknown to the law, and therefore unrestricted in extent,' is corrected (p. 30), and it is shown to be probable that 'the origin of the Christian mode of burial is to be sought in Jewish custom' (p. 42). The hypothesis of De Rossi, the pioneer in the scientific

study of the catacombs, as to the nature of the tenure of Church property—namely, that ‘the Church was organized and by law recognized as a burial society, and as such enjoyed legal protection at the same time that it was as a religious society prohibited’ (p. 53)—is considered, together with the criticisms to which this theory has been subjected by Duchesne. We may make the slight objection that the arguments on either side are here merely stated without being fully discussed, though doubtless a lengthy discussion would be out of place in a handbook.

From the catacombs the writer passes to Christian Architecture and the Basilica. After considering other opinions which have been held as to the origin of this form of building (that it was an invention of an architect in the time of Constantine, that it was derived from the civil basilica or from a school building), he adduces very strong grounds for concluding that its origin is to be sought in the private house, which we know from the New Testament to have been used for purposes of worship from the earliest times. It is only the Roman house, with its *alae* or rooms flanking the *tablinum*, which will account for the transepts of the basilica, a feature, moreover, which ‘appears only in Rome, or in lands directly under Roman influence.’ Again, this theory accounts for the disuse of the nave in early times.

‘A peculiarity connected with early Christian worship—one which had a great effect upon the architecture, inasmuch as it exacted a strict adherence to the three-aisle scheme—was the location of the faithful in the side aisles and transept, rather than in the nave, which was more commodious, better provided with light, and distinctly more convenient both for seeing and hearing. Strange as this custom is, it seems to have its explanation in the fact that the nave corresponds to the open court of the atrium, which was unprotected from the weather and, therefore, constituted the least desirable room’ (p. 100).

From the basilica we are led on to the central or domed type of church, ‘from a building which had no history and only a modicum of architecture . . . to the study of an intricate and original development on purely architectural lines’ (p. 132). The various species of this type of building are passed in review, culminating in the wonderful St. Sophia, in which the two types of church architecture—the basilica with its horizontal lines and the domed type with its central axis—were successfully combined. The next section of the work deals with Pictorial Art, which falls into three main divisions, the frescos of the catacombs (second and third centuries), sculpture (fourth and fifth), and mosaics (fifth and sixth centuries). These are all treated

in great detail and with much skill. The rough frescos of the catacombs, with their frank simplicity of design, their employment of certain recognized symbols (often showing much ingenuity), and their avoidance of painful themes, such as the Crucifixion, offer a striking contrast to the elaborate realism of the art of the Middle Ages. The writer has not failed to note the way in which the literature constantly illustrates the work of art, nor again the bearing on the Canon of the New Testament of the subjects represented. The book concludes with chapters on the minor Arts and Civil and Ecclesiastical Dress, and an appendix contains a full bibliography. A word must be added on the illustrations which are given in great profusion throughout the text, and are admirably executed. Slight misprints have been noted on p. 3 ('to' omitted before 'classic art'), p. 90 (Sulpicius Severus), p. 275 (? read 'one cannot *but* be struck'). In a word, it may be said that the book will be found an indispensable companion by any student entering on the subject and desiring guidance for further research into any of its branches.

IV.—BOOKS ON MISSIONS.

Foreign Missions. A Volume of the Oxford Library of Practical Theology. General Editors, Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT and Rev. D. STONE. By the Rt. Rev. E. T. CHURTON, D.D., late Bishop of Nassau. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.) 5s.

BISHOP CHURTON's knowledge is wide and his enthusiasm deep; his theology is catholic, and he has personal experiences of foreign work which must give his book great value for missionaries in the field. If this is what was contemplated by his publishers and editors we have no fault to find with the book. Its style may be rather too rhetorical, and its quotations overdone, but it will fulfil its purpose admirably. What we looked for ourselves in such a volume—the only one in the series to be devoted to its special subject—was not a *manual for missionaries* but a *manual of missions*, a book from the perusal of which an ordinary layman might get up, feeling that now, if never before, he knew what missions were all about; what was their *raison d'être*, what their history, their successes, and their failures, as exemplified in some typical instances. He will learn nothing of all this from the Bishop, unless, indeed, it be the *raison d'être*. And even this will come to him somewhat weighted. For the book is lacking, we must think, in the sense of literary proportion, of the subordination of subsidiary interests to those which

are substantive and primary. It cannot surely be necessary, in dealing with a subject like missions, to begin at the beginning of theology, and to go down to the end of Church polity—to the necessary extrusion, for want of space, of all information about missions, all notice of eminent missionaries. And this same lack of perspective characterizes the book in other ways. It is wanting in light and shade; no points are led up to or enforced; no due subordination of details makes crucial principles stand out; so that little, we are sorry to think, can remain on the mind of the reader in the way of vivid impressions.

Foreign Missions. A volume of 'Manuals for the Clergy,' General Editor, ARTHUR ROBINSON, B.D. By HENRY H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Tasmania, Secretary of the S.P.G. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.) 2s. 6d. net.

BISHOP MONTGOMERY'S admirable little book gives us exactly the Manual of Missions which we desiderated in Bishop Churton's. The space at his disposal is very limited—about enough, in the hands of most men, for a book with all the vices of a manual. The Bishop would have had every excuse if he had given us just the suggestions which nobody finds suggestive, and just the chips of information which anyone can learn by heart, and which nobody remembers to any purpose. As a fact, into this limited compass he has compressed the very kind of information which gives one an adequate impression of the spirit which pervades a religion, of what is its strength and weakness, what its relation to Christianity, what the side upon which it must be approached. This can then be followed out and expanded by aid of the accompanying list of books—books, as far as we are in a position to estimate them, of just the right kind for beginners, being short, interesting and simple, capable of serving as introductions to more comprehensive study. The historical and biographical information which a Manual of Missions should convey appears to us to be felicitously chosen. It is presented in an interesting form, free alike from the gush and exaggeration which are the bane of many missionary societies, and from that over-dryness and aloofness which has equally marred the publications of the Bishop's own Society. Good times are in store for the S.P.G. if this specimen of its Secretary's work is an indication of how he is to serve it; of how near he can bring its great objects to the hearts of simple readers.

Official and Lay Witness to the Value of Foreign Missions. By G. LONGRIDGE, of the Community of the Resurrection, Author of *The History of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta*. (London : S.P.C.K., 1902.)

EXACTLY the kind of compilation which is wanted by advocates of missions who have to meet the calumnies and exaggerations of the detractors of native converts and the interested, one-sided statements of half-informed residents among the heathen. It is taken entirely from the utterances of laymen, chiefly officials, in a position to estimate fairly the civilizing and ameliorating effects which Christianity produces among its converts.

Via Christi. An Introduction to the Study of Missions. By LOUISE MANNING HODGKINS, M.A. (New York : the Macmillan Company. London : Macmillan and Co. 1901.) 2s. net.

VIA CHRISTI forms the introductory volume to a series of 'Manuals of Missions,' planned by a committee of the 'Ecumenical Conference' of missionaries held at New York in May 1900. It gives, with a good deal of the saplessness of outlines, sketches of missions to the heathen in the Apostolic age, the ages from St. Paul to Constantine, from Constantine to Charles the Great, from Charles the Great to St. Bernard, from St. Bernard to the Reformation, and from the Reformation to our own day. By far the most helpful features of the book—which are apparently to recur in subsequent volumes—are the admirable series of extracts, the suggestions for study, and the lists of books for following out the suggestions, which occur at the end of each chapter. The book is a good deal marred by occasional slovenliness in the composition, amounting in some cases to actual bad grammar. But the liberality of spirit which it displays and the large amount of information it contains make one readily forgive these little lapses.

V.—THEOLOGY, DOGMATIC AND APOLOGETIC.

The Passing and the Permanent in Religion. By MINOT JUDSON SAVAGE, D.D. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.)

THE subject with which this book deals is one of extreme importance and difficulty. It demands adequate learning, insight, patience, and humility. Of these qualities we find here few traces. Dr. Savage seems to have a simple formula at hand for all cases : whatever appeals to him is permanent, whatever he dislikes is transitory

He is evidently one of those who, having been trained in a narrow Calvinism, have vehemently cast it off, and with it the Christian Creed which he identifies with it. For our Lord as a saint he has a genuine reverence, and will call Him 'Son of God,' and 'Saviour,' in the sense that He knew and taught us perfect love for God, which is our only salvation; but he cannot regard Him as Very God, the Revealer rather than the Discoverer of the Father. God is in no other way made known to us than as each successive age attains to nobler conceptions of Him. If phrases in the Bible point to another sort of revelation, they are either put down as the expressions of a superannuated faith, or are summarily set aside as interpolations. What can be said of a writer who asserts that 'the best scholars in the world suppose, what seems to me beyond reasonable question, that this whole passage in the New Testament about the keys and Peter [sc. Matt. xvi. 17-20] was an afterthought and an interpolation after the claim on the part of the Roman power had been put forth' (p. 220), when the passage in question occurs in all the best manuscripts, and is quoted by Tertullian and Origen? Again, he asserts roundly that 'Jesus never organized or established any Church at all,' or 'any sacrament' (p. 222). Scholars may contest a disputed reading, and theologians may discuss its meaning; but what is the proper title for a writer who summarily sets aside a passage because he does not like it? Again, what student of history would endorse the statement that 'the people who revolted at the time of the Renaissance were not only clearer-headed than those who had thought out the old conceptions, but they were nobler hearted?' (p. 124). Bruno, for instance, and Ochino nobler than Aquinas! It is typical of the writer's carelessness that he talks (p. 173) of the 'three or four hundred churches' in Rome 'dedicated to the different Marys.' According to Murray, the total number of churches in Rome is something over 324.

A similar heedlessness is to be found in statements of a different character. 'Every man alive prays every day of the year, and every hour of every day that he is conscious. . . . What is the essence of prayer? If I wish a thing, I am praying. . . . Anything that I strive to attain I pray for, and I pray to God for it, because, all things being ordered by God's law, to obtain a thing we must comply with His conditions' (p. 204). Then Napoleon was a man of prayer, because he said that God was on the side of the largest battalions; and Palmer, the murderer, because he carefully observed the action of strychnine. We have perhaps said more than enough to show the superficiality of the writer. It is pleasanter to praise than to blame, and we are glad to add that there are some good thoughts in his book. Much of

his protest against Calvinism we endorse. We welcome his censure of the horrible caricatures of hell which he quotes from writers of Mr. Spurgeon's type, and alas! from Jeremy Taylor. He would hardly be an American if he had not some shrewd thoughts keenly expressed. We will quote two passages with which we cordially agree:

'Do you think, then, that men are going to cultivate their religious natures by going out, as they say, under the stars, to be lifted by the general influences of nature; by going into the woods, because Bryant has said they were God's first temples; by playing golf in the midst of some beautiful scenery? . . . The religious nature of men, if it is to be cultivated, must have some time, some specific, definite time devoted to it, and some specific, definite, patient, earnest effort. . . . What is the use of joining a Church. . . . Cannot you be just as powerful, just as consecrated, alone? No, you cannot, and you know you cannot, in every other department of human life except religion. Why should you there?' (pp. 232-234).

'All the Hindoos, all the Buddhists . . . are engaged with their utmost power—all their philosophies, all their religions, exist to the one end—in trying to get rid of being re-incarnated; while here we are picking it up as though it were a new find, and something very delightful. The one object of all their religions is to escape it. Before we take it up too readily I think it would be worth while to find out why they are working so hard to get rid of it' (p. 306).

The Soul in the Unseen World: an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Intermediate State. By R. E. HUTTON. (London: Rivingtons, 1901.)

THIS book is so good that we regret that it is not better. It is clumsily put together, there is a great amount of repetition, and a good deal that is hardly relevant. The account of the views prevalent among the heathen is too short for completeness, and too long in proportion to the rest of the book; though in this section we read with pleasure the examination of the Greek Anthology (pp. 94-106).

Very little is directly taught in Holy Scripture about the Intermediate State, but we hardly think Mr. Hutton does justice to the amount of indirect teaching. If God works by evolution rather than by cataclysms, the manner in which He deals with souls here is some index of the way in which He deals with them there. We think a good deal of light might be gained by a clear exposition of the meaning of such words as Eternal Life, the Vision of God, Salvation, Forgiveness, and the like. We think Mr. Hutton falls into the danger, of which he warns us (p. 136), of laying too great stress upon the Scriptural use of terms of locality with respect to the

unseen world. That the Bible does use such terms we fully allow, and that if a figure is used in Holy Scripture it is a suitable figure; yet we should remember that such terms are figurative, and not press them into a geographical assertion that there are two or three 'places' for the departed. One more complaint we feel bound to make is that very little notice is taken of the teaching of Origen (the suggestion that his doctrine of restitution is interpolated (p. 253) gives too much weight to the arbitrary work of Vincenzi), or of Dante, and nothing at all is said of the teaching of St. Catherine of Genoa, whose spiritual view of Purgatory has been manipulated to make it accord with the prevalent *doctrina Romanensium*. We venture to point out the error (p. 25) of ascribing to the second Council of Constantinople the condemnation of pre-existence, which is really due to a local synod a year or two earlier.

With such reservations we have much pleasure in commending Mr. Hutton's work. He points out that in the Patristic period we have no dogmatic account of the intermediate state. Paradise is, to the early Fathers, another name for Heaven, blessed with the vision of God, but capable of an increase of felicity at the resurrection of the body. The imperfect depart to Hades, where they find a discipline which cleanses the last stains of sin. For those who are thus being perfected the Church on earth offers prayers and Eucharists that they may have an increase of refreshment, peace, and light, though they already enjoy the assurance of future beatitude (pp. 225-231). St. Augustine suggested—St. Gregory the Great asserted—that the purgation of these imperfect souls would be by fire. St. Thomas Aquinas, in his earlier writings, 'argues that Purgatory and the Hell of the lost are one and the same place,' though the fire operates differently on the imperfect and the reprobate (p. 262); but at a later time he came to teach that Hell and Purgatory are different places. The Latins differed from the Greek at the Council of Florence 'on two points, namely, that Purgatory is a place distinct from Hell, and that souls are punished therein by corporeal fire' (p. 263). But what 'corporeal fire' is, and how it acts on discarnate souls, was not defined; nor, indeed, was either the separate locality of Purgatory or the nature of its fire asserted in the decree of the Council. With similar reserve the Council of Trent asserts in general terms that 'there is a Purgatory, and the souls there retained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar;' but in another session it opened the way to superstition by speaking of the 'penalty of temporary punishment, to be discharged in this world, or in the next in Purgatory' (p. 289). Mr. Hutton rightly describes as 'altogether heathenish' the doctrine that

God inflicts on His children in Purgatory the most severe agony, not so much to cleanse them from the stain of sin, or even to warn others not to trifle with venial sins, as to satisfy the supposed claim of His justice for temporal penalty ; and he shows by many terrible quotations how this view, which he identifies with the *doctrina Romanensium* of our Articles, is the ground on which the modern doctrine of indulgences is based. An indulgence in early times was a relaxation of canonical penance for those who, for grievous sins, were cut off from the Church and her communion ; in the modern sense, an indulgence is a payment of temporal punishment on behalf of those whose sins have been forgiven before ever they could enter Purgatory. But when Mr. Hutton says that in the teaching of some recent theologians Purgatory has ceased to merit the name, he should have given some other authority than an Anglican essay which says : 'Since the time of Bellarmine it is commonly believed that souls become neither better nor worse in Purgatory ; they are perfect in love, and ready for Heaven. All that remains is to pay the debt due for their sins' (p. 350).

That the purgation after death may entail severe pain of penitence is likely enough when we consider how deep the root of sin lies in us, and it may well be inferred from the Scriptural figure of 'fire' as that which cleanses. That such pain is consistent with great peace and joy in the fuller knowledge of God and the assurance of forgiveness will not be doubted by those who have had the like experience of mingled shame and joy of a first confession. Mr. Hutton demurs to the application to this discipline of the name of Paradise, which he regards as without example outside a small school of Anglicans. We are not convinced that the word 'Paradise' in Holy Scripture and in the Fathers is strictly used of a state from which pain is absent. It seems to us rather to signify a state in which joy is present. And we hardly know what term is less likely to suggest wrong conceptions. We are, indeed, quite at liberty to use the word Purgatory, for the Twenty-second Article does not condemn Purgatory in general, but only 'the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory' ; but there is some difficulty in using a term in one sense which other persons use in another—the term in this case being one which is not of primitive antiquity, and likely to perplex our brethren of the Eastern Churches. On the other hand, to use the word 'Hades' might be to perplex those who are already perplexed by the carelessness of the Authorized Version, which translates 'Hades' and 'Gehenna' by the same word 'Hell.' On the whole, we plead that the use of the word 'Paradise' is less likely to convey wrong ideas than any other ; and if St. Athanasius allowed that some were orthodox who refused the term

'consubstantial,' it is not impossible that the true doctrine may in this case be expressed by (if it be so) inexact language.

We are most grateful to Mr. Hutton for repeatedly urging the duty and the blessing of prayer for the departed. He does not point out (with Moehler) that the prejudice against this sort of prayer is closely connected with the Lutheran notion of salvation by the imputation to us of the merits of Christ, rather than by the bestowal on us of His life, whereby we also may become truly holy. If salvation is merely the declaration that the penalty of our sins is remitted, there is no need of prayer for those whom God has already assured of forgiveness. But if salvation is the real eradication of evil and implanting of virtue, and men pass out of this world with this work still imperfect, then the work of salvation is prolonged beyond death, and also our participation in it by means of prayer. Mr. Hutton does good service by pointing out how many phrases in the Prayer Book point in this direction; yet we are bound in candour to confess and to lament that the English Church has failed to teach her children clearly to pray for the departed. Such teaching would not be an addition to the scanty indications of Holy Scripture, but an interpretation of its command to pray for all men, that those men who are passed out of sight are not to be excluded from this general order.

There are a few errors and misprints which may be corrected in a future edition, to which we sincerely hope this excellent book will come. Berthold, not Simon Stock, was the founder of the Carmelites (p. 322). On p. 158 *παπαδελφος* is a misprint for the genitive. On p. 200 we observe 'Ærius' for 'Aerius'; on p. 238, 'Hippolitus'; on p. 262, 'Thonas.' In several places insufficient references are given for quotations.

The Chief Truths of the Christian Faith. A series of instructions to Church Workers. By the Rev. J. STEPHENSON, M.A., Vicar of Forton, Gosport, and Rural Dean of Alverstoke. (London: Methuen, 1902.)

It is a sign of great helpfulness, indicating the vitality and strength of the Church of England, that a large number of capable men exist in her comparatively obscure places who can expound Church principles in a clear and forcible way, from abundant stores of theological learning when need arises. This book is an example in point. It treats of many great doctrines in a brief space, for the benefit of educated lay people, unversed in the technical terms of theology, who desire help in the study of the Faith. The instructions were given in their original form to the Winchester Diocesan

Community of Deaconesses and other church workers, and have now been rewritten and expanded in a serviceable form for lay readers, school teachers, mothers, and church workers in general. Some objection might possibly be taken both to what is included in the book, and what is omitted from it, and to the order of arrangement. For example, Mr. Stephenson has advisedly omitted Confirmation, because it did not seem to him to come within the scope of his work. A relatively large amount of space is given, in the introductory part, to the subject of authority. The principle of authority, of external sources or guarantees of knowledge, in controlling private judgment is shown to be indispensable, and to be justified by the method of our Lord's own teaching. The Scriptures and the Church are described as the two means which God uses in the communication of truth to man, and the subject of the origin, nature, and mission of the Church is further elaborated in the last chapter of the book. In successive chapters Mr. Stephenson gives orderly and excellent instruction on the being and nature of God, the Holy Trinity, the origin, nature, and fall of man, the Incarnation and the Atonement, the two Sacraments of the Gospel, the Eternal Future, and the Person and Mission of the Holy Spirit. There seems no reason why the chapter on the Future should not, as the Creed certainly suggests, come last, after the treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and the Church. There is no index, but a well-arranged table of contents enables the reader easily to find what he wants, and the value of the book is greatly increased by its references to other works and by a list of books which are such as lay workers may be likely to have within their reach. We hope that this book may teach some educated lay readers whose profound ignorance of Church principles is in striking contrast with their culture in other matters.

Catholic Faith and Practice. A Manual of Theology. Part II., by the Rev. A. G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia. Second edition revised. (London, New York and Bombay : Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.)

WHEN the first edition of this book was published we expressed our sense of the signal service which Dr. Mortimer had rendered to the whole Anglican communion, and in particular to students of exact theology, by the production of so useful a compendium of Christian doctrine and practice.¹ We made some few reservations, as that in some cases the agreement of mediæval and later divines was perhaps too readily accepted as Catholic consent, and that in regard to the

¹ See the *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1899.

invocation of saints Dr. Mortimer seemed to be disinclined to accept the clear decision of the Church of England at the Reformation. But these criticisms of details were not intended to detract from the merits of the book as a whole, and we gladly repeat the testimony to its value which we gave three years ago. Among the subjects dealt with in this volume are Holy Matrimony, Anglican Orders, Extreme Unction, the Inspiration of Scripture, the Limits of Theological Speculation, the Mystery of Suffering, Justification, and Eschatology in its various aspects; and all are treated with method, sound learning, and a true sense of proportion. In regard to matters which are disputable, both sides of the case are fairly stated; and though the view which seems preferable to Dr. Mortimer will not always perhaps commend itself to all his readers, the student of systematic theology can hardly begin his study under better guidance. At least, we know no book which we could recommend more heartily for the purpose.

Die Bedeutung des Artikels von der Gottheit Christi für die Ethik.

VON D. H. CREMER, Professor der Theologie zu Greifswald.
(Leipzig: Dörffling and Franke, 1901.)

THIS is a short essay on a momentous subject. Is morality the end and aim of Christianity, or is it only a consequence, another and a higher purpose being the aim—though, of course, all would agree that morality must be an attendant circumstance? The historical connexion between Christianity and morality may be undeniable. It may be regarded as a fact beyond question that the recognition of love as the basis and principle of ethics is due to the Gospel. But perhaps when once the ideal of love is clearly before men, Christianity has done its work. Doctrine is the sphere of all disputes and contentions; ethics the sphere in which all are at one. If the Christian ethic be accepted, doctrine may be what it will. And so there might be a common ground on which all denominations of Christians could meet.

With opinions such as these the writer has no sympathy, and he sets himself to challenge the assumptions which underlie them. Doctrine is not, he maintains, so indifferent in relation to ethics. 'Catholics' and Evangelicals are really widely separated in their ethical conceptions. Both agree that love of one's neighbour is the highest command, but it makes a great difference what is the fundamental conception at the back—whether, for example, that good works make the good man, or that the good man makes the good works. And these differences are indissolubly connected with doctrine. The conception of Christ as a God-man, the Son of God who has

condescended to us, to be like us and to belong to us for ever ; and the conception of Him as a member of our own race, a man with a special mission—these are different religions. This is the main thesis which Dr. Cremer upholds. He insists that unless the eternal Godhead and the humanity of Christ be recognized, He cannot even be the great example, still less the object of faith and prayer and hope. So, first of all, he seeks for the reasons which move and compel us to believe in His Godhead. He suggests a simple test. There are only two powers before which all bow—the powers of sin and death. The Lord of these is the Lord and God whom we can trust for all eternity, wherever He meets us. Does He meet us in Jesus Christ ?

The argument by which the affirmative answer to this question is reached is interesting and eloquently expressed. We cannot follow it in detail. Miracles are left on one side ; they do not prove the divinity : faith is not dependent on miracles, but miracles are dependent on faith. Sins are not only error and mistake, but a striving against God and opposition to His will. It is the sufferings and death of Jesus that reveal to us our sins and His Godhead, while the Resurrection confirms the fact which the Cross discloses. The fundamental significance for ethics of the article of the Godhead of Christ is found in the judgment on us and our sins—so relentless, so sharp, so annihilating—that is accomplished on the Cross. Only the belief in His Godhead constrains us to this judgment, this self-condemnation, which determines the Christian's whole attitude to the moral purpose of his life. And so the religion of redemption and atonement, it is argued, sets Christians in complete opposition to the theory of development, according to which there is no gap in history, and Christ is no irregular appearance, but, born as we are, takes His place in the ordinary development of mankind.

Against this theory, which sees in Jesus only the fruit of development, 'which to-day holds almost all the educated world in its grip,' Dr. Cremer argues with much force, and has no difficulty in showing that for 'Biblical Christianity' the thought is an utter impossibility. Development of 'civilization' may be recognized, but civilization is not morality. No man can develop into a child of God. Man is justified, not through development, but only by grace—born again only through the wonderful love of God, which is known to us only by the Cross of Christ, when it became a *fact* of history. Therein He lowered Himself to us, and thereby we are aroused to an entirely new relation to Him, and the love of Christ which is the result is something other than perfect morality.

On this, in conclusion, Dr. Cremer writes with deep feeling and

devout piety. 'The article of the Godhead of Christ is nothing but the doctrine of the wonderful love of God.' This is the conclusion.

We are in full sympathy with Dr. Cremer's chief aims and conclusions, and gladly recognize the eloquence and sound reasoning of his argumentation. It is indeed quite clear that Christianity has something very much greater than mere morality as its aim and necessary result, and that, apart from the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God, there is no sure basis for the belief in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men ; but the fact is so often ignored at the present time that it is a matter for thankfulness that voices should be raised, not only in this country, but also in the land where the doctrine is more lightly held, to maintain and defend it.

To whom shall we go? An Examination of some Difficulties presented by Unbelief. By the Rev. C. T. OVENDEN, D.D., Canon of the National Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin. (London : S.P.C.K., 1902.)

THIS is a small but valuable book dedicated 'to an honest critic whom love has not blinded.' In dealing with doubt the writer avoids the dangers of the controversialists of what Mr. Hutton called the 'Hard Church,' and no one will feel at all hurt by his manner of presenting his arguments. His matter is derived in part from the writings of Dr. Salmon, Archbishop Magee, the Duke of Argyll, Bishop Phillips Brooks, Provost Jellett, and others. The thoughts of these writers have been incorporated into Canon Ovenden's own mind, and are here expressed with much ability and conciseness, first upon the foundation-stones of revealed religion, and, secondly, upon the principal causes of unbelief and the reasonableness of Christian doctrine.

The Creed of an Evangelical Churchman. By the Rev. H. LAWRENCE PHILLIPS, Curate of St. Paul's, Greenwich. (London : Elliot Stock, 1902.)

THIS is a very clear and temperately worded statement of the beliefs held by 'Evangelical' members of the Church of England. It is likely to be useful to those who agree with the author for purposes of instruction. And it might be well for many 'High' Churchmen to read it carefully and observe how very much there is in the way of fundamental truth about which they are at one with 'Evangelicals,' in spite of teaching about the Church and the Sacraments which they will necessarily regard as inadequate or untrue. Here and there Mr. Phillips departs from the fair spirit and careful language which

mark most of his book, as, for instance, when he calls non-commun-
icating attendance a 'dishonour' to our Lord, or suggests that the
Roman Church has 'deprived her people' of the Eucharist,' or uses
some passages in the Bishop of Worcester's *The Body of Christ* for
purposes for which, we feel sure, they were never intended. We
have noticed some errors in the printing of Greek words, and a
parenthetical sentence on page 18 has evidently slipped in by
mistake.

*Revised Catechism, being an Examination and Revision of the West-
minster Assembly's Shorter Catechism.* By the Rev. DUFF
MACDONALD, M.A., B.D., Minister of South Dalziel Parish,
Motherwell, Author of *Africana*. With a preface by the Rev.
ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity, Edinburgh
University. (London : A. and C. Black, 1902.) Price 2s. 6d.
net.

THIS book contains a brief history of the *Shorter Catechism* of the
Westminster Assembly, criticism of the substance and method of it,
and a suggested revised form. The publication of the criticism and
the suggestions is significant of lines of thought which are of some
influence among the Scottish Presbyterians. The object is to bring
the phraseology of the *Catechism* to be more in harmony with the
language of Holy Scripture, and to some extent to 'liberalize' its
theology. Representative instances of suggested changes are that in
the revision Holy Scripture is not described as 'the *only* rule to
direct us how we may glorify and enjoy' God, and it is not said of
'the souls of believers' that they 'are *at their death* made perfect in
holiness, and do *immediately* pass into glory.'¹

'*Is there a Religion of Nature?*' By P. N. WAGGETT, M.A.
(S.P.C.K.)

ANYTHING from the pen of Mr. Waggett is sure to contain original
thoughts incisively expressed. These lectures, given in St. Paul's
Cathedral, perhaps represent him at his best. The philosophic
foundations of naturalism have of late been vigorously attacked from
several quarters ; the little book before us deals very effectively with
the ethical consequences of this view of things. It is practical rather
than theoretical in purpose, and a book which we hope may come
into the hands of many young men of the present day. The parish
priest who has to deal with persons disturbed with difficulties of the
naturalistic type, and indeed the preacher in general, will find the
book useful and suggestive.

¹ The italics are in each case ours.

The Origin and Propagation of Sin. Being the Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge in 1901-2. By F. A. TENNANT, M.A. (Camb.) and B.Sc. (Lond.), Student of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (Cambridge : at the University Press, 1902.)

IN his Hulsean Lectures Mr. Tennant has made a bold attempt to grapple with a very difficult problem. He has found himself unable to accept even 'the irreducible residue of the doctrine of the Fall and its effects upon the race'; and sees difficulties, which taken together he regards as insuperable, to any 'theory of the corruption of our nature by a fall.' Thinking the theory of 'original righteousness,' a 'transition from implanted goodness to actual sin,' 'the derangement of the whole nature by an act, or even a course of sin,' and the 'transmission' of 'results' of sin to the 'posterity' of those who first sinned alike untenable, he rejects the doctrine of original sin altogether, and has endeavoured to formulate a new position which may allow for 'universal sin' and 'individual guilt.'

The essential feature in the constructive part of Mr. Tennant's work is that he considers the origin of sin to have consisted not in some act always known as wrong and hitherto abstained from, but in the continuance of action the wrongfulness of which was beginning to be recognized; and that he regards every individual as meeting the possibilities of sin with a nature which has not been injured by any act or course of sin in the past history of the race. Both now and at the first, he says, sin is to be ascribed to 'the difficulty of the task which has to be encountered by every individual person alike, the task of enforcing his inherited organic nature to obey a moral law which he has only gradually been enabled to discern.' Our nature, he maintains, is now 'normal,' and 'the natural product of a course of evolution whose only ultimate cause is God'; 'our inborn faculties have not been affected by a catastrophic Fall'; it is 'our nurture alone and not our nature' that is 'marred by human sin'; we must not look in the narrative in the third chapter of Genesis for 'truth of final or permanent value on the historical, psychological, or scientific questions which seem to be involved'; modern methods of interpreting Holy Scripture make it unnecessary to accept 'the Pauline conception' of an 'historical Adam from whom the human race derives its woes.'

Mr. Tennant, it will be observed, rejects such a view of the Fall as that expressed in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam, and in the late Mr. Aubrey Moore's *Essays Scientific and Philosophical*, as well as the older ways of stating

the doctrine of original sin. And he does not allow to the opening chapters of Genesis that value which, from a critical and scientific standpoint resembling his own, has been asserted by Dr. Driver in his *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament* and the Bishop of Exeter in *The Early Narratives of Genesis*.

The book before us is marked by great knowledge, clear and earnest thought, and reverent expression. The tone with which the difficult questions of which it treats are approached and handled is admirable. The view it advocates does not appear to us to have been established. It is, we think, contrary to the general trend of Holy Scripture, as well as to particular passages. It conflicts with doctrines of sin and atonement and grace to which the Universal Church is very deeply committed. It is insufficient to account for the facts of life, which call for something more than that explanation of universal sin which Mr. Tennant considers adequate.

Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. The Fifth Book. By RICHARD HOOKER. A new edition, with Prolegomena and Appendices. By RONALD BAYNE, M.A., University College, Oxford; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Greenwich. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. New York: the Macmillan Company. 1902.) Price 15s. net.

THIS new edition of the fifth book of Hooker's great treatise *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* is based on Keble's second edition, published in 1841. The seventh edition, revised by the late Dean of St. Paul's and the present Bishop of Oxford, has also been used and referred to. Features which deserve notice are the summaries at the beginning of each chapter; the translation of the Greek and Latin quotations of Hooker himself and of Keble, in the case of the latter with some curtailment; the citation in full of the passages in Holy Scripture referred to by Hooker; and explanations and references, in some cases of great interest, not previously given. A short life of Hooker is prefixed; there is a useful statement on his 'style and characteristics'; and there are essays on 'the disciplinarian party in the reign of Elizabeth' and 'Hooker's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.' This edition will not, we think, altogether supersede the second volume of that by Dean Church and Bishop Paget; and it will not make Bishop Paget's *Introduction* unnecessary. It will, in many ways, be more useful to the general reader than either of these valuable works; and scholars will find it needful to add it to them among their books.

The essay on 'Hooker's doctrine of the Lord's Supper,' though it contains much of interest, is less satisfactory than the treatment

of the same subject in Bishop Paget's *Introduction*. It assigns an interpretation which is not the only possible interpretation to certain sentences, and lays great stress on this; it does not allow for the different sides of Hooker's teaching or for his statement that he puts aside the question of the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament before Communion; it does not deal with Hooker's belief as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice,¹ on which there are two helpful pages in Bishop Paget's book.

Mr. Bayne's work forms a volume of Messrs. Macmillan's 'English Theological Library,' edited by the Rev. Frederick Relton. It contains the short but valuable 'General Introduction' written by Bishop Creighton for the series.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VI. October 1902. No. 13. Macmillan and Co.). 'Contentio Veritatis,' by the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. 'A Study of the First Lesson for Christmas Day,' by the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D. 'The History of the Theological Term Substance,' Part III., by the Very Rev. T. B. Strong, D.D. 'Psychology and Religion,' by C. C. J. Webb. Contains an admirable criticism of Professor James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience.'

The Expositor (Nos. XXXIV.-XXXVI. October and December 1902. Hodder and Stoughton). 'St. Matthew xxviii. 16-20,' by Rev. Professor H. B. Swete. 'The Idea of the Fourth Gospel and the Theology of Nature,' by the Rev. Principal Fairbairn, D.D. 'A Lost Chapter of Early Christian History,' by Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D. 'The Story of Queen Tryphæna.' 'The Scope of the Ministry,' by the Rev. Alfred E. Jarvie, M.A., B.D. 'All Things are Yours,' by the Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A. 'The First Epistle of St. Peter and the Book of Enoch,' by the Rev. Professor Carl Clemen, D.D., Halle. 'Specimen of a New Translation of the Prophets,' by the Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D. 'The Basis of Christian Certainty,' by the Rev. James Stalker, D.D. Christian certainty rests on a threefold basis—the Bible, the authority of past ages, Christian experience. Each standing alone is insecure; united they form the sound basis of Christian belief. But in the course of his argument the writer instances the doctrine of the Sacrament, and of the apostolic succession, as a proof of the errancy of tradition; yet not only have the Sacraments the authority of tradition, they are also accepted by many people as sanctioned by Scripture, while the evidence of Christian experience is no less in their favour. Where then is certainty? 'The Function of the Miracles,' by the Rev. Alfred E. Jarvie, M.A., B.D. 'On the Meaning and Scope of Jeremiah vii. 22-23,' by the Rev. Professor Ed. König, D.D. 'The History of a Conjectural Emendation,' by Professor T. Rendel Harris, M.A. (1 Peter iii. 19). 'Dialogues on the Christian Prophets,' by the Rev. F. C. Selwyn, D.D. (v. and vi.). 'A Parish Clergyman's Thoughts about Higher Criticism,' by the Rev. G. S. Streetfield, M.A. This article is written for the bulk of Christians who, through insufficient acquaintance with the subject, are unable to form a just estimate of the

¹ There is, however, a note which touches this subject on pp. 507, 508.

recent theories of higher criticism. It is maintained that common sense will serve us in discriminating between criticisms; that the rejection of parts of the Bible as literal history is a gain and not a loss; and, finally, that the evidence of Christ's personality and the experience of individual Christians are facts which no criticism can affect. 'The Bright and Morning Star,' by the Rev. James Moffat, D.D. 'Our Lord's Use of Common Proverbs,' by the Rev. David Smith, M.A. 'The Semitic Sacrifice of Reconciliation,' by the Rev. Professor Ives Curtiss, D.D.

Critical Review (Vol. XII. September-November 1902. No. 5, 6. Williams and Norgate). 'Recent Work in Egyptology and Assyriology,' by Rev. Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D. Professor Sayce is inclined to trace the Ancient Egyptian dynastic civilization to Babylon, thus finding in Babylon the first essays of civilized man. Among books reviewed we notice 'The Varieties of Religious Experience,' by Professor James, on which H. Wheeler Robinson has commented at considerable length; 'Dr. Chase's Credibility of the Book of the Acts,' favourably criticized by R. J. Knowling; Weinstein's 'Zur Genesis der Agada'; and Koerberle's 'Natur und Geist,' by James Kennedy. In the November number the two most interesting reviews are one by Dr. Plummer, on 'Recent Theories respecting the Third Gospel,' and one on 'Personal Idealism'; 'Philosophical Essays by Eight Members of the University of Oxford,' by the Rev. H. R. Mackintosh.

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. I. No. 1. October 1902. Williams and Norgate). This journal is to be open to writers of all shades of thought, religious or philosophical. Neither dead forms of thought nor 'advanced thought' is invited, but thought which advances, and as the 'goal of thought is One,' it is hoped in this way to approach that 'inner unity' which underlies all divergences. The subject of the first article is 'The Basis of Christian Doctrine,' by Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D. A reformulation of doctrine is needed; as a basis the historical record is hardly dependable; in our day doctrine must be psychologic, founded on observation and experience. Our Christian doctrines in their essence have profound roots in human nature, but 'in our creeds, confessions, and articles of religion they are mixed up with mythic history and abandoned philosophy'; our theology also requires to be freed from the cramping influence of Greek rhetoric, that it may 'conform to what is loftiest and most severe in the suggestions of modern science.' 'The Concept of the Infinite,' by Professor Josiah Roger, Ph.D., LL.D. The following is the conclusion reached: 'I believe it to be demonstrable that the real universe is an exactly determinate but actually infinite system, whose structure is that revealed to us in self-consciousness.' 'The Outstanding Controversy between Science and Faith,' by Sir Oliver Lodge, D.Sc., F.R.S., shows how in every fundamental respect religion and science are diametrically opposed. The writer states the case for each, but does not attempt to judge between them. 'Mathew Arnold,' by Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, LL.D. '"Righteousness of God" in S. Paul's Theology,' by Principal James Drummond, LL.D., Litt.D. 'Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Gospels,' by F. C. Conybeare, M.A. 'Catastrophes and the Moral Order.' Professor G. H. Harrison writes on the impossibility of reconciling the existence of evil with the rule of a loving God. The Rev. R. A. Armstrong and the Rev. R. F. Horton seek to prove the contrary.

The Expository Times (Vol. XIV. October-December. Nos. 1-3.

Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark). 'Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter,' a 'Comparison and a Contrast.' By the Rev. Martin Lewis, B.A. Two most attractive characters placed side by side, the rugged impetuous Puritan and the gentle, sweet-tongued Churchman. 'Holy Living and Dying,' and 'The Saint's Rest,' are compared, showing that in the latter, for the most part rough or unpolished, there are occasional flights of eloquence which surpass even the best of Taylor's passages. 'The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles,' by the Rev. Edward R. Bernard, M.A. 'The Disuse of the Marcan Source in Luke ix. 51-xvii. 14,' by the Rev. John C. Hawkins, M.A. 'Miracles and the Supernatural Character of the Gospels,' by Dr. Sanday. A striking article. Starts with the assertion that miracles, or what were thought by the apostles to be miracles, certainly happened. This is an attested fact, though the miracles may not have been what we now understand by the term. 'Theological Intellectualism: a criticism of Dr. Fairbairn's Philosophy of the Christian Religion,' by the Rev. W. Morgan, M.A., pronounces the work to be marred by its intellectualistic bias, also accuses the author of employing indefinite terms. 'Little Contributions to the Greek Testament,' by Professor Eberhard Nestle, D.D.

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXXXI. October 1902. No. 263. Burns and Oates). 'The Power behind the French Government,' by T. B. Milburn. That power, according to the present writer, is Freemasonry. It is the Freemasons, the enemies of Rome, the denounced of the Pope, who are to be held responsible for the recent outburst of anti-clerical violence. 'The Influence of Christianity on the Dramatic Ideals of Character,' by D. Moncreiff O'Connor. 'The World Empires of Rome and Britain,' by Rev. W. H. Kent, O.S.C. 'Undesigned Coincidences in the Old Testament,' by Rev. Hugh Pope, O.P. 'Contemporary Picture of the Religious Troubles in England, 1642,' by M. H. Especially interesting is the graphic description of the destruction by the Puritans of the pyramid in 'Chepeside.' 'Experiments in the Training of Teachers in Secondary Schools in Germany,' by the Rev. Lambert Nolle, O.S.B. 'The Magi: a Foot-note to Matthew ii. 1,' by the Very Rev. L. C. Casartelli, M.A. 'The Earliest Christianity in China,' by Professor E. H. Parker.

The English Historical Review (Vol. XVII. October 1902. No. 68. Longmans, Green, and Co.). 'The Sources of the History of St. Francis of Assisi: a Review of Recent Researches,' by Professor Little. 'Supplementary Notes on Tiréchan's Memoir of S. Patrick,' by Professor Bury, LL.D., D.Litt.

The Classical Review (Vol. XVI. October-December 1901. Nos. 7-9. David Nutt). 'Perry's Sancta Paula,' by T. R. Glover. The writer points out numerous historical inaccuracies in Mr. Perry's romance. 'The Golden Bough and the Rex Nemorensis,' by Arthur Bernard Cook. The writer challenges Frazer's explanation of the Arician cult, upon which rests the framework of the 'Golden Bough.' The Rex Nemorensis is not an incarnate tree-deity, but, like the Rex Sacrorum, 'a religious successor of one who had been also a temporal king.' Even the title cannot be sanctioned. These errors, however, only slightly affect the value of the work, which depends in reality on generalizations with regard to magic and early religion. 'Wissowa on Roman Religion,' by Frank Granger.

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XV. No. 57. October 1902. Macmillan and Co.). 'The Jews of England in the Thirteenth Century,' by T. M. Rigg. 'The Neo-Hebraic Language and its Literature,' by Professor J. D.

Wyn
fession
of Te
Blau.
7
Marsh
propo
instru
by vol
Free
quent
atmos
heroic
The w
degree
says,
Church
attack
Bill.
the TV
of the
advan
Shows
progre
the ed
difficul
Unfort
been a
Th
Co.).
Emile
philoso
Th
Co.).
largely
remedy
trust co
organ o
The
'The G
art dur
Conway
there ar
the sain
Crisis,'
on the
Power,
shown,
at reform

Wynkoop. 'Ein neuerschlossenes Capitel der jüdischen Geschichte,' by Professor W. Bacher. 'Abraham's Lesson in Tolerance,' by S. A. Kohut. 'Methods of Teaching the Talmud in the Past and in the Present,' by Professor Ludwig Blau.

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 442-444. October-December 1902. Horace Marshall and Son). 'Politics and Education,' by Augustine Birrell, K.C. It is proposed that parents should be consulted at stated intervals as to the religious instruction they wish their children to receive, and that denominational teaching by voluntary effort should be supplied accordingly. 'The Education Bill and the Free Churches,' by Dr. Robertson Nicholl. Articles of this nature from frequent repetition are beginning to grow wearisome. 'Priestcraft' and 'Church atmosphere' are urged as the danger of the Bill, which is to be resisted by an heroic refusal to pay the rates. 'The Newer Dispensation,' by E. Wake Cook. The writer elucidates the theories of Christian science, claiming for them a high degree of truth and wisdom. He may be right, but what does he mean when he says, 'Christian science reinforces Christianity just on those points dropped by the Churches'? 'The Shuffled Government,' by Herbert Paul. The Government is attacked in unmitigated terms, chiefly, of course, on the ground of the Education Bill. 'S. Augustine and the Roman Claims,' by Joseph McCabe. 'S. Francis and the Twentieth Century,' by M. Paul Sabatier. The ideal of St. Francis and that of the present century are compared, showing how far the Saint of Assisi was in advance of his time. 'Catholicism versus Ultramontanism,' by Voces Catholicæ. Shows the ridiculously intolerant attitude of the extremist towards scientific progress. 'Thus Far,' by J. A. Spender. A fair-minded article dealing with the education question. The writer believes the only solution of the religious difficulty to be in the system of 'denominational teaching in regulated hours.' Unfortunately this solution, which has suggested itself to many minds, has not been accepted by either the House of Lords or the House of Commons.

The Edinburgh Review (No. 402. October 1902. Longmans, Green, and Co.). The Centenary Number. 'The Rise and Influence of Darwinism.' 'M. Emile Faguet and the Eighteenth Century.' A survey of French history in its philosophical and religious bearings.

The Quarterly Review (No. 392. October 1902. Longmans, Green, and Co.). 'National Sobriety.' The writer looks upon the tied-house system as largely responsible for the growth of intemperance, and believes the most effectual remedy to lie in the 'public management of the retail liquor trade by means of trust companies.' 'The Roman Index.' Traces the history of this still powerful organ of Roman intolerance. 'Modern Pessimism.'

The Monthly Review (Nos. 25-27. October-December. John Murray). 'The Golden Age of Egypt,' by John Ward, F.S.A. A sketch of Egypt and its art during the Twelfth Dynasty. 'A Portrait of S. Francis Assisi,' by Martin Conway. The writer speaks of the lost portrait by Melormus, of which, however, there are several copies. He has no doubt that the original picture represented the saint without the stigmata. 'The French Prelates on the Politico-religious Crisis,' by Maurice Geroweth. Gives the views of the leading French Cardinals on the question of religious education in France. 'Democracy and Temporal Power,' by Robert Edward Dell. The absurdity of the Papal claims is clearly shown, also the pernicious influence of Ultramontanism, checking every attempt at reform, every movement of progress.

The Economic Review (Vol. XII. No. 9. October 1892. Rivingtons). 'The Ethics of Employment,' by John Garrett Leigh. 'Attacks pseudo-philanthropists,' especially employers who build model villages for their workpeople, on the ground that it pampers them, robs them of their moral responsibility, and is a subtle form of tyranny. 'The Next Step in Social Policy,' by Rev. T. C. Fry. 'The Report of the Oxford House,' by F. J. Wylie. 'Some Experiences in South London,' by Theodora Nunns. Reviews of books include Muirhead's 'Philosophy of Life,' Sidney Ball; Maurice Defourney's 'La Philosophie Positiviste,' E. Fallaize; Cleveland Hall's 'Crime in its Relation to Social Progress,' W. C. Craft.

Studi Religiosi. (No. V. September-October, 1902. Rome). 'Storia dei Salmi, La poesia religiosa degli Ebrei anteriore ai Salmi,' by S. Minocchi. 'Le Monete del prezzo Guida. Ricerche di Numismatica biblica,' by L. De Feis. 'Le vie romane della Palestina,' by L. Grammatica.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift (October-November, 1902. Nos. 10-11. Erlangen und Leipzig. Deichert). 'Kleine Beiträge zur evangelischen Geschichte. 1. Der zerrissene Tempelvorhang,' von Prof. D. Th. Zahn. 'Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert,' von Prof. D. Th. Kolde. 'Arnold von Brescia,' von Pfarrer Karl Wulz. 'War "Jahve" eine kanaanaische Gottheit?' von Prof. D. Ed. König. 'Ethische Fragen. Arthur Schopenhauer,' von Prof. D. Wilh. Schmidt. 'Hauptprobleme der gegenwärtigen Dogmatik,' von Privatdozent Nic. Grützmacher.

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Nos. III.-IV. Copenhagen, 1902. G. E. C. Gad). Provst P. Johs Jensen: 'Et Indlæg i Forfølkningen af 1 Petr. iv. 1-6.' Criticism of Kaltenbusch's 'Das apostolische Symbol,' by Pastor H. Hoffmeyer, and Rudolf Sucher's 'Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion,' by Sognepræst E. Geismar. IV. 'Bemærkninger til Problemet: Jesus Kristus, Guds Søn,' by Sognepræst N. P. Arboc-Rasmussen. 'Om Ordninger af Præstevalg i protestantiske Kirkeforfatninger.'

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien (No. III. 1902. Paris, A. Picard et fils). 'L'Eucharistie et les Repas Communs des Fidèles dans la Didache,' by Abbé P. Ladeuze. It is the writer's aim to show that the Agape and the Eucharist were never identical, as some have maintained. He relies chiefly on the Didache, in which he finds evident mention of both feasts, separate and distinct. Acts ii. 46-49 he takes as referring to the Agape. 'Sophrone le Sophiste et Sophrone le Patriarche,' by R. P. S. Vaillé, A.A. 'L'Inscription Syriacque de Krâd-ad-dâsiniya dans l'Émésène,' by R. P. S. Ronzevalle, S.J. 'Les Madag ou Sacrifices Arméniens,' by R. P. D. Girard, S.J. 'Ἡ παπικὴ ἐγκύκλιος καὶ ἡ Ἀθηναία καπιτώλειος χῆν,' by Χαράλαμπος Χρησοκόπος. 'Les Nosairis dans le Liban,' by R. P. Lammens, S.J. 'Vie de Sainte Marine. VI. Texte haut-allemand, et VII. Texte bas-allemand,' published by Léon Clugnet.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (No. IV. October 1902. Université Catholique de Louvain). 'Le Contractus Germanicus ou les controverses sur le 5% au xvi^e Siècle en Allemagne,' by E. van Roey. 'Le Pseudo-Justin et Diodore de Tarse,' by F. X. Funk. 'Le Gallicanisme en Sorbonne d'après la correspondance de Bargellini nonce de France (1668-1671),' by A. Cauchie.

Revue Biblique Internationale (No. IV. October 1902. Lecoffre, Paris). 'Le Temple d'Echmoun à Sidon: fouilles exécutées par le Musée Impérial Ottoman,' by Macridy-Bey. 'Note sur les inscriptions trouvées par Macridy-Bey, à Boston-ech-Cheik,' by R. P. Lagrange. 'L'Angélogologie Juive à l'époque

néo-
of ang
books,
Masso
ment,
by M.
Jansse

Bu
Toulon
the Jul

Th
Univers
Religio

that re
ing wit
cause o
Profess
His see
they o
triumph
ment'

gelists
Christ'
Excava
Allan

Th
Philade
sophy,'
'Infinit

less tha
writer
Westm

Cat
and the

by T. S
the writ
people

Catholi
Written

'Sister
'Anarc
between

Notable
Nichola
of the

Gilbert
Eliot,'
'Leo X

tarianis
from th

néo-testamentaire,' by M. Hackspill. Describes the functions and classification of angels. Drawn partly from the Old Testament, but chiefly from the apocryphal books, that of 'Enoch' in particular. 'Petite introduction à l'étude de la Massore,' by M. Hyvernât. 'Le Saint Suaire de Turin et le Nouveau Testament,' by M. Ulysse Chevalier. 'Les destinataires de l'épître aux Ephésiens,' by M. P. Ladeuze. 'Nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes de Petra,' RR. PP. Janssen and Savignac.

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, publié par l'Institut Catholique de Toulouse. (No. IX. November 1902. Paris, Lecoffre). Contains an account of the Jubilee of the Institute.

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. VI. October 1902. No. 4. The University of Chicago Press). 'The Fundamental Principles of the Science of Religion,' by Frank Byron Jevons, Litt.D., M.A. The writer seeks to prove that religion is not governed by a law of evolution, but is an historical science dealing with individuals. The whole argument hinges on individual effort being the cause of progress. 'Is there a self-consistent New Testament Eschatology?' by Professor George B. Stephens, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Our Lord's predictions of His second coming, the resurrection, the judgement, are not to be taken literally; they only embody certain vague statements concerning the future, 'the certain triumph of His kingdom,' 'the victory of life over death,' 'the principle of judgement'; any more definite teaching is due to His misinterpretation by the Evangelists and others. How, we should like to know, are we to judge between Christ's sayings and those attributed to Him? 'The Old Testament and the Excavations,' by Professor Karl Budde. 'The Virgin Birth,' by the Rev. T. Allan Hoben.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review (Vol. XIII. October 1902. No. 52. Philadelphia: MacCalla and Co.). 'Personality the Supreme Category of Philosophy,' by Edward H. Griffin. The whole is summed up in the last words, 'Infinite Thought, Infinite Will, Infinite Love—this is the God of Philosophy no less than of Religion.' 'The Blessed Trinity,' by Robert McCheyne Edgar. The writer emphasizes the ethical necessity for the Trinity. 'The Printing of the Westminster Confession,' by Benjamin B. Warfield.

Catholic World (October–December 1902. New York). 'Cardinal Gotti and the Propaganda,' by James Murphy. 'S. Francis Xavier and Unitarianism,' by T. S. Discusses Dr. Hales's views on the great missionary saint. It is a pity the writer cannot refrain from such a palpable misstatement as that 'all pagan people who have ever been Christianized have been converted by missionaries of the Catholic Church.' 'The Reawakening of Ireland,' by Leumas MacManus. Written from a strongly anti-English standpoint. Describes the Gaelic League. 'Sister Marie du Sacré-Cœur, a Reformer of Education,' by Suzanne de Castomir. 'Anarchy and Government,' by W. F. C. Scholasticus. 'The Mystical Nuptials between our Lord and some of the Saints,' by Georgina Pell Curtis. 'Two Notable Utica Pioneers,' by John C. Brogan. A sketch of the work of John and Nicholas Devereux. 'The Religious Element in Modern Poetry.' Vindication of the rights of the people. 'The Educational Crisis in England,' by Rev. Gilbert Simmons, C.S.P. Favours the Education Bill. 'The Ethics of George Eliot,' by Georgina Pell Curtis. 'Unitarianism and Foreign Missions,' by J. S. 'Leo XIII.: his Enemies and Critics,' by Rev. D. J. MacMackie, D.D. 'Unitarianism and Religion in Education,' by J. S. We are told that 'Catholics from their cradles to their graves never know a doubt in religion.' 'The Saint

of Lindisfarne,' by Mary F. Nixon-Roulet. 'The Basis of a Catholic Novel,' by Rose F. Egan. 'The Recent Evictions in Brittany,' by the Comtesse de Courson. 'A Practical Talk on Church Building,' by Charles D. Maginnis.

The Indian Church Quarterly Review (Vol. XIV. July 1902. No. 3). 'Bishop James of Calcutta,' by the Rev. W. K. Firminger, M.A. 'The Monophysite Question,' by the Secretary to the Most Rev. the Syrian Metropolitan. The writer is of the opinion that the Syriac Fathers acted under a misapprehension in rejecting the Council of Chalcedon, their apparent departure from the orthodoxy of the Chalcedon definition being due to an inadequate mode of expression, and not to heretical doctrine. 'The Parochial History of an Indian Station,' by the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer, M.A., F.S.A. 'Assam as a Mission Field,' by the Ven. Archdeacon Mitchell. 'S. Thomas Aquinas on Revelation and Reason,' by the Rev. Father Foley, S.S.I.E. Extracts from S. Thomas's 'De Veritate Catholicæ Fidei.'

BOOKS RECEIVED, PAMPHLETS, REPRINTS, ETC.

Gift-books, &c., published by the S.P.C.K.

The Frozen Treasure. By C. DUDLEY-LAMPEN. An exciting story, full of hair-breadth escapes, describing the adventures of a Scotchman in search of treasures buried in the ice near Archangel.

Frank Denham, Foreman. An artisan, honest and conscientious, but indifferent to religion, becomes a good Churchman and sincere believer, chiefly through the influence of his foreman, Frank Denham.

Against the Grain. By CATHERINE E. MALLANDAINE. The story of a noble self-sacrifice. It is well told.

The Will and the Way, by the same author, tells of a poor village boy who, in spite of many difficulties, raises himself to the rank of lieutenant in the army.

A Brave Little Cousin. By BESSIE MARCHANT. The scene is laid in Queensland.

A Lost Leader. By DOROTHEA TOWNSEND. This book is well written. The interest lies in the adventures of Richard Harrison, a young Roundhead, during the reign of Charles II. The 'lost leader,' his ideal and hero, is General Harrison.

The Boys of Spartan House School. By FREDERICK HARRISON. A book full of incident.

Mrs. Moffat's Brownie. By FRANCES HARIOTT WOOD. The 'brownie' is a little union girl, who is the means of transforming cantankerous Mrs. Moffat into a loving old woman.

Tales of Christian Heroism. By Rev. T. M. NEALE, D.D. Dr. Neale's well-known stories reprinted.

The House at Brambling Minster. By BESSIE MARCHANT. Deals with the pranks of a harum-scarum family. Excellent for a mothers' meeting.

The Dawn of Day. 1902.

Pictorial Church Teaching. Well got up and nicely illustrated. A delightful book for small children.

Mr. and Mrs. Tiddiwinks. Written and illustrated by EDITH FARMILOE.

Happy Days and Happy Work in Basutoland. By Deaconess MARIA S. B. BURTON. 6d.

The Church of England. An Historical Sketch. By the Rev. H. W. CARPENTER, M.A.

Preparation for Holy Communion. Contains a short form of preparation.

Rain Blossoms. By EDITH HARVEY BROOKS. A helpful little book. Contains short readings of a simple character. Intended for the sick and those in trouble.

Notes for One Year's Sunday School Lessons. By the Ven. JAMES M. WILSON, M.A., Vicar of Rochdale, and Archdeacon of Manchester. Series I. It is a wonderful thing that a Senior Wrangler should be willing to devote himself to writing Sunday School Lessons, and it is a great thing for the Church and Christianity that he should be.

We have also received from the S.P.C.K. the usual selection of Churchmen's Almanacks, &c., which they publish in every form likely to be of use to anyone.

From the Church of England Sunday-School Institute.

A Five Years' Course of Bible and Prayer-Book Teaching.

Lessons on the Sunday Gospels. By the Rev. C. A. GOODHART, M.A.

The Boys' and Girls' Companion. 1902.

The Church Worker. Vol. XXI. 1902.

The Home Beautiful. An Address to Parents. By the Rev. Prebendary MURDOCH JOHNSTON.

Go. Address to Sunday-School Scholars. By the Rev. EDWIN J. STURDER.

Spiritual Training in the Sunday-School. To Sunday-School Teachers. By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF CREDITON.

From Lucknow Methodist Publishing House.

The Great Co-Operation. By COLONEL DOWDEN.

From Macmillan and Co.

'*I Live.*' By the Most Rev. JAMES EDWARD COWELL, Lord-Bishop of Calcutta. 1s. 6d.

The Consecration of the State. By J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D. 2s.

Essays of Richard Steele. Selected and edited by L. E. STEELE, M.A. 2s. 6d.

The New Pupil. By RAYMOND JACBERNS. 4s. 6d. And *The Other Boy.* By EVELYN SHARP. 4s. 6d. Two excellent children's stories.

Just-so Stories, for Little Children. By RUDYARD KIPLING. Illustrated by the Author. 6s. Both the stories and pictures are wonderful—perhaps the most wonderful things that the author has produced. We need not say more.

From C. Arthur Pearson, Limited.

The Eldorado of the Ancients. By DR. CARL PETERS. 21s. We do not feel attracted to the methods of modern concession hunters by doubtful archaeology and indifferent word-painting.

From Funk and Wagnall's Company.

Jesus, the Jew, and other Addresses. By HARRIS WEINSTOCK.

From Charles H. Kelly.

The Art of Noble Living. By ROBERT P. DOWNES, LL.D.

From Marshall Brothers.

Methods of Bible Study. By the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITHS THOMAS. 1s. 6d.

From Cambridge University Press.

A Concise Bible Dictionary.

S. Matthew. Revised Version. Edited, with Notes for the use of Schools, by ARTHUR CAW, M.A.

From Burns and Oates, Limited.

Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics. Vol. V. Hey-Zoo. By JOSEPH GILLOW. 15s.

From A. R. Mowbray and Co.

Jo, the Giant Killer. By the Right Rev. ARTHUR CHANDLER, Bishop of Bloemfontein. 6d., cloth 1s. Gives a realistic picture of East-end life.

The Layman's Bible Series. By the Rev. GERARD SAMPSON, of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield.

The Epistle to the Romans. 1s.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. 1s.

Mothers of God's Children. Twelve Old Testament readings for mothers. By the Rev. G. LACEY MAY. 1s.

Christian Duty. By the Rev. VERNON STALEY. 1s. Containing Devotions, Meditations, and Instructions. An edition without Part Third, *Christian Practice*, 6d.

The Cowley Carol Book. Edited by Rev. G. R. WOODWARD, M.A. 1s., cloth, 1s. 6d. Old melodies beautifully harmonized.

Worship and Matter, or the Worship of Almighty God through Images. By ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A.

From 'Home Words' Publishing Office.

The Fireside Pictorial Annual. 1902. Conducted by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. 7s. 6d. A most excellent gift-book for Christmas.

The Day of Days. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. 2s.

The Coronation Thanksgiving. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. 2d.
Home Words for Hearth and Home. Conducted by the Rev. C. BULLOCK, B.D. 2s.

Hand and Heart. Illustrated Tales. Vol. for 1902. Edited by H. SOMERSET BULLOCK, M.A. 2s.

From Elliot Stock.

The True Ground of Faith. Five Sermons. By Rev. R. S. MYLNE, M.A. 2s. 6d.

Proverb Lore. By F. EDWARD HULME, F.S.A. Contains a store of interesting material. As a book to read its sameness is likely to become wearisome, while for purposes of reference the arrangement is scarcely clear enough.

Realities of Life. Being thoughts gathered from the teachings of Rev. H. R. HAWES, M.A. By JESSIE M. OLIVER.

The Way, the Truth, the Life. A Practical Handbook for Bible and Confirmation Classes. By A. G. GIRDLESTONE. 2s.

A Manual for the Sick and Sorrowful. Arranged by E. S. L. 3s. 6d.

From Skeffington and Son.

The Enthusiasm of Christianity. By the Rev. CHARLES T. OVENDEN, D.D. 3s. 6d.

Watching for the Daybreak. Plain Sermons. By the Rev. J. GEORGE GIBSON, D.D. 5s.

When a Man dies where does he go? By a PRIEST OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. 2s. 6d.

Consolations and Warnings. By the Rev. HERBERT POLE, M.A. 3s. 6d.

The Altar Manual. By the Rev. J. EDWARD VAUX. 1s. 6d.

Help from Holy Communion. By the Rev. WELING WHELPTON. 2s.

Catechizings for Church and Sunday School. Second Series. By the Rev. J. HASLOCK POTTER and the Rev. A. E. W. SHEARD. 2s. The system advocated by this book has already been adopted by several clergymen. The lessons given are too scanty to be of much service.

From Church Extension Association.

Quotidie. By F. A. G. EICHBAUM, M.A. 3s. 6d. Devotional readings gathered from numerous well-known writers.

From Longmans, Green, and Co.

Anima Christi. By the Rev. JESSE BRETT, L.Th. 1s.

From Hodder and Stoughton.

The Representative Men of the Bible. By GEORGE MATHESON, D.D. 6s.

From T. and T. Clark.

Joseph and Moses, the Founders of Israel. By the Rev. BUCHANAN BLAKE, B.D. 4s.

From Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.

The Way to the Father. By the Rev. JOHN WAKEFORD, B.D. 2s.

The Laundry at Home. By K. F. PURDON. 3d., cloth 6d. Contains a store of useful hints.

Father Dolling. By B. J. CLAYTON. 1s. It is refreshing to read a book of this sort. The attractive personality of Father Dolling makes itself felt in every page, while at the same time we realize that not only personal charm but immense unremitting labour was necessary to the success of his work.

The Twentieth Century for Christ. A Sermon by the Rev. T. LLOYD WILLIAMS.

Twice Saved. Sermon preached by the BISHOP OF LONDON at the Thanksgiving Service for the King's recovery.

From William Blackwood and Sons.

Readings on the Evolution of Religion. By Mrs. F. HAY-NEWTON. 5s.

From James Nisbet and Co.

God and Greater Britain. By the Rev. ROBERT DOUGLAS. 3s. 6d.

From the Oxford University Press.

Day by Day of the Christian Year.

From the Church Printing Company.

A Kalendar of the English Church and Ecclesiastical Almanack for the Year of Grace 1903.

The Church and 'The Churches': an honest Eirenicon. By JOHN PETER PAUL, M.A. *Id.*

We are glad to receive a second edition of Dr. Swete's *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (Macmillan and Co.). The author writes in his Preface: 'In the preface to the first edition I expressed a desire to discuss more fully at a future time some of the larger questions raised by the Gospel of St. Mark. This purpose has not been fulfilled. The book has been revised throughout; the critical apparatus has been enlarged by the use of the fresh evidence printed in Mr. Lake's *Texts from Mount Athos*; the footnotes have been here and there expanded or rewritten. But the pressure of other work and the call of fresh studies have precluded me from attempting the dissertations which I had intended to write.' We are sorry, but we can personally quite sympathize with Dr. Swete.

We are glad to receive also four numbers of a new series of *Occasional Papers* of the Eastern Church Association, a society which is perpetually renewing its youth: No. I., *A Synopsis of Oriental Christianity*, by ATHELSTAN RILEY; No. II., *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates*, by the Right Rev. JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury; No. III., *A List of Books on Eastern Christendom*; No. IV., *The Ceremonial Use of Oil among the East Syrians*, by the Rev. F. F. Irving, D.D. They are published by Parker and Co.

We have devoted so much space to the Education Question that we cannot do more at present than mention three excellent pamphlets: *Undenominationalism*, by R. C. MOBERLY, D.D. (John Murray); *The Education Question and the Liberal Party*, by the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, D.D. (Longmans); and a *Letter from the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., on the Criticisms of an Opponent of the Education Bill, 1902* (Eyre and Spottiswoode). We can only take this opportunity of testifying to the ability, capacity, patience, and temper displayed by the new Prime Minister in taking the Bill through the House of Commons. It is certainly the greatest parliamentary achievement of recent years.

INDEX TO VOL. LV.

ACT

ACTS of the Apostles, The
 credibility of the, 388 *sqq.* :
 Mr. Bartlett's (in *Encyclopædia
 Britannica*) *résumé* of recent
 work on the Acts, 389; Mr.
 Rackham's commentaries on the
 book, *ib.*; Dr. Chase's work
 on its *Credibility*: its method
 and reasoning, 390; Dr. Sel-
 wyn's *St. Luke the Prophet*
 criticized, 391; Archbishop Ben-
 son's *Addresses* on the Acts,
 392; questions of date and text,
ib.; St. Luke's use of his sources,
 393; Dr. Chase's view of the
Quellenkritik, 394; St. Luke's
 historical accuracy tested by
 archæology, 395; Schmiedel's
 criticism of Ramsay on this point,
 396; the relations of the Acts to
 St. Paul's Epistles, 397; accuracy
 of St. Luke as a portrayer of
 doctrine, 398; he was acquainted
 with the story of the Virgin
 Birth, 399; examples of doctrinal
 development, 400; discussion of
 miracles related in the Acts, 401;
 the miracle at Pentecost, 402;
 unsound method of Dr. Chase in
 treating difficulties, 403; on such
 points 'caution and reserve' re-
 commended by Dr. Sanday, 404
 Amelli, Dom, *S. Hieronymi Trac-
 tatus contra Origenem de Visione
 Esaiæ*, 206

BAYNE, Rev. R., new edition
 of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical
 Polity*, Book V., 497
 Benson, Rev. Father, *Saint Col-
 umba*, 249
 Best, Rev. Kenelm Digby, *A
 Priest's Poems*, 250

CHU

Bethune-Baker, Rev. J. F., *The
 Meaning of Homo-ousios in
 the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed*
 ('Texts and Studies,' vol. ii. No.
 1), 201
 Beveridge, Mr. A. T. G., *An Essay
 on the Relation between Faith
 and Reason*, 229
 Birmingham Bishopric, The, 430
sqq.: the growth of town popu-
 lations: results on Church ar-
 rangements, 430; need of di-
 vision of dioceses, 431; suffragan
 bishops a makeshift, 432; story
 of the desired bishopric for
 Birmingham, 433; pecuniary
 and other difficulties, 434;
 culmination of these, 435;
 renewed efforts in 1893:
 another collapse, 436; peculiar
 position of ecclesiastical affairs
 in the city, 437; a stronghold of
 Nonconformity, 438; how much
 can be done by a resident bishop,
 439; the 'impracticably vast'
 work of the Bishop of Worcester,
 441 *sqq.*; renewed hopes and ef-
 forts, 443; the only sources from
 which help can be expected, 445;
 the present Archdeaconry of Bir-
 mingham will probably constitute
 the new Diocese, 446; kind of
 man needed for its bishop, 447
 Books received, Pamphlets, Re-
 prints, &c., Notes on, 255, 504

**CATHOLIC Church from
 Within**, The (Anon.), 472
 Churches in Ireland, The Three,
 257 *sqq.*: characteristics of early
 Irish Church, 258; subjected to
 Norman England and to Rome,
 259; treatment by Henry VIII.,
 Edward VI., and Mary Tudor,

CHU

260; changes wrought by Elizabeth: (Roman) Catholicism proscribed, 261; the Church of the Pale, *ib.*; a struggle of race and religion, 262; policy of James I.: Celtic land system broken up, *ib.*; the Established Church of Ireland, 263; penal laws enforced, 264; introduction of Presbyterianism, *ib.*; the rising of 1641: barbarous deeds and barbarous vengeance, 265; Cromwell's treatment of Established Church, *ib.*; changes under Charles II., 266; James II.: Catholic tyranny in place of Protestant, 267; events after the Revolution, *ib.*; the Protestant Colonial Parliament in Dublin, 268; Protestant ascendancy in 18th century: abasement of Catholics, 269; Erastian establishment, 270; results, *ib.*; dawn of better days: movement of 1782, 271; improvement in Roman Catholic Church, 272; position of Presbyterians, 273; events after Union and after Reform Bill, *ib.*; condition of Established Church, 274; altered character of Roman clergy, 274 *sq.*; later position of Presbyterians, 276; the Disestablishment, and results, *ib.*

Churton, Bishop, *Foreign Missions* ('Oxf. Lib. of Practical Theology'), 483

Cobb, Rev. Dr., *The Church's Outlook*, 470

Common Worship, A Book of (Anon.), 462

Confession and Absolution, 300 *sqq.*: the Fulham Conference, appraised, 300; M. Batiffol's essay on *Origines de la Pénitence*: the rigorism of the Early Church, 301; the rule was private confession and public penance, 302; relaxation of rigorism; treatment of repeated lapses, 303; of those whose sins were not overt, 304; the sort of sins brought under discipline, 305; the meaning of Divine Forgiveness, 305 *sqq.*; forgiveness is the 'sending

CRI

away' of sins, not of God's vengeance, 307; God's forgiveness is the restoration of the penitent to health and service, 308; the Church's exercise of Christ's commission, 309; the form of absolution, 310; Canon Aitken's view that it should be precatory only, 311; Father Benson's contrary view, 313; reasons for this view, 314; office of absolution recreative rather than judicial, 316; 'limited confession,' 317; 'compulsory confession,' 318; special training needed for minister of penance, 319 *sq.*

Contentio Veritatis (review of the work 'By Six Oxford Tutors'), 363 *sqq.*: comparison with *Lux Mundi*, 363; spirit and attitude of the writers, 364; lack of unity of purpose, 365; defective social sympathy, and limited experience, 366; criticism of Mr. Wild's essay on the Teaching of Christ, 369; his treatment of the death of Christ and its consequences, 370; examination of Mr. Inge's essay on the Person of Christ, 372; his views on the Atonement, 374; the Sacraments, 375; doctrine of substitution, 376; the writers' treatment of miracles, 377; of the physical Resurrection, 378; their philosophic basis, 382; some minor criticisms, 385; Mr. Carlyle on the Church, 386

Cremer, Professor D. H., *Die Bedeutung d. Artikels von d. Gottheit Christi für d. Ethik*, 492

Criticism, Rational and irrational, 147 *sqq.*: vicissitudes of criticism of theological questions, 147; theology in the new volumes of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 148; the late Robertson Smith's article on the Psalms contrasted with Dr. Cheyne's views, 149; the latter's method and conclusions stated, 149 *sq.*; and criticized, 151; other applications of his 'Jerahmeelite key': the sojourn in Egypt, 152; the story of Paradise, 153; sober views of

EDU

textual criticism : Dr. Strack (in *Hastings*) on the Old Testament, and Clark and Wright on Shakespeare, 154; valuable critical works by English authors on the Scriptures, 155; Nestle (in *Hastings*) on textual criticism of New Testament, 156; position of Westcott and Hort's text, *ib.*; *Encyclopædia Biblica's* treatment of New Testament subjects, 156 *sq.*; Dr. Van Manen on 'Old-Christian Literature'; sacred or secular, canonical or uncanonical, all of this literature is simply one in kind, 157 *sq.*; his views about the ostensible authors and recipients of books of the New Testament, 159; on the Pauline Epistles, *ib.*; a modern literary clique style of criticism, 160; Van Manen on our Lord's parables, 160 *sq.*; on the Christology of the Epistles, 162; criticism of Van Manen's and Schmiedel's opinions on Acts of the Apostles, 163; other views of theirs repudiated, 164; Dr. Cheyne's responsibility as editor, 165; *Hastings' Dictionary* contrasted with *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 167; the true principles of Biblical criticism, 168

EDUCATION and Religious Liberty, 169 *sqq.*: old and new views of religious toleration and State interference, 170; contact with education involves contact with religious or non-religious belief, *ib.*; evil effects of the Reformation on education in England and of sluggishness in later times, 171 *sq.*; need of State interference and of State-supported education, 172 *sq.*; disadvantages met by the new Bill, 175; education a possible instrument of tyranny, 175; the recent example in France, 176; secularist and Nonconformist methods in the religious controversy in Board Schools, 177; the rights of parents as to

GER

religious education of children, 178; the views of Dr. Dale and Mr. Chamberlain, *ib.*; the working of purely secular education, 180 *sq.*; 'an undenominational Christianity' is impossible to be invented, 182; meaning of 'denominationalism,' 183; the value of a Catechism, *ib.*; denominationalism is connected with Church life, 184; its benefits to Christian morality and to Christian unity, 185; relations of undenominationalism to religious liberty, 186; how it works injustice, 186 *sq.*; it is as unfair as pure secularism, 188; examples of the working of a rational system of religious instruction: Transvaal, Cyprus, New Zealand, Germany, *ib.*; Rhodesia, 189; the Cowper-Temple Clause, 190; Mr. Forster's views in 1870, 190 *sq.*; a suggestion that the Parish Council should manage the schools, 191; examination of the Education Bill's provisions: in towns, 192; in the country: Nonconformists' grievances, 193; how met, 193 *sq.*; of small minorities: suggested 'facilities,' 194; representation of ratepayers, 195; Church schools and their masters, 196; Nonconformist attitude and its object, 198; Sir Joshua Fitch on the popular faith in voluntarism, 199; Bishop Creighton on carelessness about education, 200

FIELD, Rev. J. E., *Saint Berin, the Apostle of Wessex*, 249
Fiske, Mr. J., *Life Everlasting*, 235

GALTON, Rev. A., *Our Attitude towards English Roman Catholics and the Papal Court*, 468
Gaskin, Mr. R. T., *Cædmon, the First English Poet*, 248
Gerard, Rev. Father, S. J., *A Course of Religious Instruction for Catholic Youth*, 476

GIR

Giraldus Cambrensis, The life and times of, 341 *sqq.*: his birth and parentage, 341; born in troublesome times, 342; studied in Paris, ordained in Wales, 343; his character in youth, 343 *sq.*; assistant to his uncle, the Bishop of St. David's, 345; Archdeacon of Brecon, *ib.*; examples of his energetic action, *ib.*; exemplary in his spiritual duties, 346; his struggle for succession to his uncle's bishopric: objections of the Crown, 347; made royal chaplain and tutor to Prince John, 349; 'itinerary' of Wales with Archbishop Baldwin, *ib.*; restrained by the King from going on the Third Crusade, 351; at Lincoln, engaged in his first six works, 352; another struggle for the bishopric, *ib.*; appeals to the Pope, 353; aids national Church of Wales against supremacy of Canterbury, 354; reception at Rome by Innocent III., 355; result of second visit to Rome, 357; outlawed: a third visit to Rome, 358; further misfortunes, 359; his latter years, *ib.*; death and burial place, 362

God the Beautiful: an Artist's Creed (by E. P. B.), 463

Granville, Rev. R., *The Life of the Hon. and Very Rev. Dennis Granville*, D.D., 247

Greek, The study of, 406 *sqq.*: the recent defeat of the opponents of Greek at Oxford, 406; need of being prepared for a renewed attack, *ib.*; causes of the present assault, 407; inestimable value of the study of Greek, *ib.*; Lord Sherbrooke's belittling of Greek and Greece contrasted with Milton's views thereon, 407 *sq.*; and with Tennyson's and Freeman's, 409; the secret of Greece's attraction for students, *ib.*; its literary treasures, 410; influence, through Rome, on the world, *ib.*; knowledge of Greek a necessity to the perfect knowledge of English, 411; Greeks of old are still unapproached and unap-

HOL

proachable in mental science, *ib.*; answer to objection to forcing Greek upon unwilling boys and youths, 412; the discipline of acquiring it is beyond all price, 413; it is the most powerful aid to real education, *ib.*; its capabilities meet all demands at every stage of learning, 414; no equally valuable subject can be set in its place, 416; utilitarian objection, 418

HALL, Rev. W., *Renunciation, and Other Poems*, 250

Hodgkins, Louise M., *Via Christi*, 485

Hodgson, Mr. F. C., *The Early History of Venice*, 242

Holy Eucharist, The: an historical inquiry (Parts V. VI.), 76 *sqq.*: various declarations of doctrine in Henry VIII.'s reign: the King's *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*: maintained Transubstantiation and sacrificial character of the Mass, 77; Bishop Fisher's views, 78; 'The Ten Articles' (1536), 79; 'The Bishops' Book' (1537), 80; 'The Thirteen Articles' (1539), 81; the 'Six Articles Law,' 82; 'The King's Book' (1543), *ib.*; Edward VI.: Cranmer's doctrine on the Eucharist, and on the Sacraments, 84 *sq.*; changes introduced in the 'Order of Communion,' 86; the new Book of Common Prayer (1549): its doctrine on the Eucharist, *ib.*; uses the word 'Mass,' 87; alterations in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552): alterations in doctrine and vestments, 88; declaration on kneeling, *ib.*; meaning of 'our sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving,' 89; the forty-five Articles (1552): on the Eucharist, Transubstantiation, bodily presence of Christ, Reservation, the 'one perfect oblation,' 90 *sq.*; changes in the forty-two Articles of 1553, 91; Bishop Gardiner's doctrine, asserted against Cranmer's, 93; he accepts Transubstantiation and

HIN

the sacrifice, 94; extreme views of Cranmer's chaplain, Thomas Becon, 95; state of opinion at death of Edward VI., 98.—Changes in reign of Mary, 321; Elizabeth: modifications in revised Prayer Book of 1559, 322; the Eucharistic vestments, *ib.*; treatment of the Presence, *ib.*; the 'Eleven Articles' (Parker's &c.): 'private Masses,' 323; 'Forty-two Articles' (of 1553) revised and modified by Convocation (1563), *ib.*; their subsequent modification: ratification of the present Thirty-nine (1571), 324; their doctrine and object, 324 *sqq.*; Eucharistic teaching of the Book of Homilies, 326 *sqq.*; doctrine of Bernard Gilpin, 328; of Adrian Saravia, 329; of John Jewel, 331; his controversy with M. Harding on the Presence, 332; his doctrine of the Sacrifice, 334; views of Grindal, 335; of Sandys, 336; Hooker's position towards the Eucharistic controversies, 339

Hindus, Missions to: II. The Problems (continued), 98 *sqq.*: notice of Mr. T. E. Slater's book, *The Higher Hinduism in relation to Christianity*, 98; the identity in Hindu religion between worshipper and Worshipped, 101; difficulties of comprehending Hindu character, 102; its paradoxes and anomalies, 103; the Hindu's scepticism about life, 104; belief that he and the divine One and All are absolutely one and the same, 105; the native is incapable of truthfulness, 106; why history forms no part of Hindu literature, 107; Hindu thought pervaded by the persuasion of the unreality, the nothingness of life and its content, 107 *sq.*; evil effects on their national life produced by portrayal of their gods, 109; some obvious results of Caste: incapacity for spiritual independence and dislike of responsibility, 110; loss of sense

ITA

of right and wrong, 111; lack of moral courage, 112; the Hindu's attitude towards sinfulness and towards actual sin: vitiated by Pantheism, 113; how affected by Caste, 114; his belief that he possesses a connatural sanctity, 115; summary of characteristic results of Hindu religion, 116

Hort, Dr. F. J. A., *Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions*, 203

Hutton, R. E., *The Soul in the Unseen World*, 487

INGRAM, Right Rev. Bishop (London), *Under the Dome*, 458

In Memoriam: Frederic, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, 449; John Wogan, Bishop of St. Albans, 451; William Richard Wood Stephens, Dean of Winchester, *ib.*

Italy, The religious condition of, 44 *sqq.*: difficulty of investigation of the subject, 45; sources of information used here, 46; results of the strain between King and Pope, 46 *sq.*; the spoliation of monastic property, 47; no legal provision for relief of poor, 48; civil marriage alone legal, *ib.*; insolence and pettiness of Socialists and freemasons, 49; anti-clerical classes, 50; the majority of Italians profess and practise the Catholic religion, *ib.*; religion in the villages, 51; the people's behaviour at Mass, 52; the Italian view of prayer, 53; prayers to the Madonna and the Saints, 54; P. Genocchi's protest against the *Glories of Mary*, *ib.*; a counterpoise: devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 55; blending of superstition and prayer, 56; Italian sermons criticized, 57; lack of definite religious teaching in schools, 58; some exemplary exceptions, 59; difficulties encountered by priests in teaching Christian doctrines, 60; the popular treatment of Sunday, 61; estimate of character of the clergy, 62; standard of sexual

L L

JAC

morality in some parts of Italy, *ib.*; clerical celibacy, 63; slothful clergy, *ib.*; perfunctory performance of official duties, 64; difficulty of dealing with criminal beneficed clergy, *ib.*; criticism of Don R. Murri's *Christian Life at the End of the Nineteenth Century*, 66; the evils he deplures, and his proposed remedies, 66 *sq.*; the movement called the *Democrazia Cristiana*: its '*nuova politica guelfa*,' 67; Murri's *La Cultura del Clero*, 68; Dr. Minocchi on the stagnation in Italy of study of theology, 69; suppression of theological chairs in Italian universities, 70; hopes of better times, 71; lack of learning among Italian clergy, *ib.*; impulse now given to the reading of Holy Scripture, 72; state of religion outside the Italian Church, 73 *sqq.*

- JACKSON, Frances, *From Hearth to Cloister in the Reign of Charles II.*, 247
 Jacob, Rev. J. T., *Christ the Indweller*, 458
 James, Mr. L. J., *Mother Church and her Antagonists*, 467
 Jenks, Mr. E., *Edward Plantagenet (Edward I.), the English Justinian*, 246
 Jessopp, Rev. Canon A., *Penny History of the Church of England*, 248
 Johnston, Mr. R. M., *The Roman Theocracy and the Republic (1846-1849)*, 236

- KATTENBUSCH, Professor, *Das apostolische Symbol: Part II. 'Verbreitung und Bedeutung des Taufsymbols'*, 217
 Kidd, Mr. B., *Principles of Western Civilization*, 223
 Kingsford, Mr. C. L., *Henry V.: the Typical Mediæval Hero*, 243

LAMARCK, Darwin, and Weismann, 24 *sqq.*: conflict of opinion on method of process of organic evolution, 25; stages in

MAN

the growth of the doctrine: Aristotle's theory of 'an innate tendency to perfection,' 26; St. Augustine's explanation of the 'creation' of trees &c., quoted, uncondemned, by Aquinas, 27; Linnaeus and Cuvier's views of the fixity of species, 28; opinions of Suarez, Buffon, Erasmus Darwin, 29 *sq.*; statement of Lamarck's doctrine: the 'Lamarckian factors,' 30; Cuvier's attitude towards the transformists, 31; beginnings of Charles Darwin's doctrine: the principle of natural selection, 32; effects of his work, *The Origin of Species*, 33; Huxley's and Herbert Spencer's position towards Darwin's theory, 34; Darwin not a disciple of Lamarck, 35; Lamarck's and Buffon's factors were auxiliaries to his own factor, *ib.*; Professor Weismann's new evolutionary movement, 36; his theory of the 'continuity of the germ-plasm,' *ib.*; difference between 'somatogenetic and blastogenetic' characters, 37; the controversy on the theory: 'Neo-Darwinians' and 'Neo-Lamarckians,' 37 *sqq.*; Darwin to the last believed the transmissibility of acquired characters, 39; Darwin's theory compared with Weismann's, 40; meaning of Darwin's term 'pangenesis,' 41; present position of the rival theories of heredity, 42
 Longridge, Rev. G., *Official and Lay Witness to the Value of Foreign Missions*, 485
 Loofs, Professor, *Symbolik der christlichen Konfessionskunde*, Vol. I., 221
 Lowrie, Mr. W., *Christian Art and Archaeology*, 481

- MACDONALD, Rev. Duff, *Revised Catechism*, 495
 Macmillan, Rev. Hugh, *The Corn of Heaven*, 457
 Mandonnet, Rév. Père, *Les Règles et le Gouvernement de l'Ordre*

MAS

- de Paenitentia au XIII^e Siècle*, 466
 Mason, Rev. Dr. A. J., *The Ministry of Conversion*, 455
 McGiffert, Professor A. C., *The Apostles' Creed: its Origin, its Purpose, and its Historical Interpretation*, 216
Mirror of Perfection, The (trans. by Countess de la Warr), 467
 Montgomery, Bishop, *Foreign Missions* ('Manuals for the Clergy'), 484
 Mortimer, Rev. Dr. A. G., *Catholic Faith and Practice*, 491

NICKERSON, Rev. D., *The Origin of Thought*, 229

OMAN, Rev. Dr., *Visions and Authority*, 470

Orr, Rev. Professor, *The Progress of Dogma*, 212

Ovenden, Rev. C. T., *To whom shall we go?* 494

Oxford, Religion in, 1 *sqq.*: paucity of theological students in the University, 2; no organized study of dogmatic theology, 3; qualifications needed in a religious teacher of young men, 4; criticism of university examination in Holy Scripture, 5; the unofficial teaching of religious subjects: sermons in college chapels, 7; the preachers' opportunities and difficulties, 8; what they should aim at, 10; treatment of doubts about religion, 11; various unofficial centres of religious influence, 12; Pusey House and the Evangelical pastorate, 13; the functions of the college tutor, 14; influence of clerical Fellows, married and unmarried, 15; influences against religion: temptations to self-indulgence, 17; sketch of a student's possible daily life, 18 *sqq.*; students' opinion about drunkenness and observance of Sunday, 22; tasks which lie before workers for Christian knowledge, 23; duties of dons and of parents, 24

SAI

PERIODICALS, 251, 498

Phillips, Rev. H. L., *The Creed of an Evangelical Churchman*, 494

RESTORATION, The Church and the clergy after the, 278 *sqq.*: an age of great men, 278; treatment of Church livings, 279; poverty of clergy: appointment of inferior men, *ib.*; their social position, 281; their marriages, 282; profitable publication of sermons, 283; endowments for yearly sermons, *ib.*; use of black gown in pulpit, 284; irregular celebration of Holy Communion, 285; ceremonial, vestments, incense, 286; uncanonical manner of treating the Sacrament, 287; Baptism, 288; practice of confession, *ib.*; revival of daily services, 289; observance of Lent, 290; development of Church music: Henry Purcell, 291; use of the organ, 292; metrical psalmody, 293; books of devotion: *The Whole Duty of Man*, *ib.*; devotional writings of Non-jurors, 295; testamentary bequests to poorly endowed benefices, 296; the reign of the Squire, 297; church restoration and building: Wren and St. Paul's, 298; new churches in London, 299

Robinson, Rev. C. H., *Human Life a Revelation of the Divine*, 460

Robinson, Rev. A. W., *The Personal Life of the Clergy*, 451

Romanes, Mrs., *Thoughts on the Penitential Psalms*, 465

Royce, Professor, *The World and the Individual* (Gifford Lectures), 230

ST. MARGARET'S Lectures, The (review of *Criticism of the New Testament*, by various writers), 419 *sqq.*: object of the lectures, 419; Dr. Sanday's introductory lecture; his silence about date and authenticity of 2 Peter, 420; Dr. Kenyon on Manuscripts, *ib.*; on the varieties

SAV

- of text: the 'Western' or *8* group, 421; the term 'Neutral,' 422; in conflict with Westcott and Hort, *ib.*; Mr. Burkitt on Versions — Latin and Syriac, 423; their utility, 424; Dr. Chase on the Canon of the New Testament, 425; Mr. Headlam on the Dates of the New Testament books, 426; his method, 427; criticism of his discussion of the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles, *ib.*; excellence of Dean Bernard's lecture on the Historical Value of the Acts, 429
- Savage, Rev. Dr. M. J., *The Passing and the Permanent in Religion*, 485
- Selby, Mr. T. G., *The God of the Frail*, 461
- Shipley, Mr. Orby, *Carmina Mariana* (Second Series), 464
- Stephenson, Rev. J., *The Chief Truths of the Christian Faith*, 490
- Strzygowski, Professor Josef, *Orient oder Rom*, 478
- Swete, Professor H. B., *Patristic Study*, 200

TAUNTON, Rev. E. L., *Thomas Wolsey: Legate and Reformer*, 239

Tennant, Rev. F. A., *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, 496

The Lady Poverty (trans. by M. Carmichael), 467.

Third Order of St. Francis, The, 117 *sqq.*: St. Bonaventura's Life of St. Francis, 118; the Friars order the rejection of all other Lives, 119; some of these recently recovered and published, 120; M. Sabatier's Life of the Saint, and devoted labour on all that concerns him, 121; like work of others, 122; M. Sabatier's discovery of a Rule or Memorial of the Third Order of St. Francis, *ib.*; specimens of its

WOR

regulations, 123; origin of St. Francis's plan, 125; the time when the Rule was composed, 126; later supplements and modifications, 127; does M. Sabatier's *Memorial* point back to an older original composed by St. Francis himself? 128; various stories about the origin of the Third Order: St. Lucchesio, 130; the Third Order was the starting-point and not an afterthought of the Saint, 132; the meaning of *paenitentia* in those days, 133; this Order stands side by side with other societies called 'Poenitentes' and like names, 134; the Saint's object and aim was *poenitentia*, 135; the method and results of his work, 136; foundation of the Three Orders, 137; the aims of the various members, 138; the general title of all three divisions, 139; causes of rapid differentiation within the society, 140; account of the cognate society, the Humiliati, and their Rule, 140 *sq.*; their influence upon the Franciscans, 143; development of Franciscan Third Order, *ib.*; the section known as the *Continentes*, 144; new features introduced into the Rule, 145; the character of St. Francis 145 *sqq.*

WAGGETT, Rev. P. N., *Is there a Religion of Nature?* 495

Welcker, Adair, *A Dream of Realms beyond us*, 249

Westcott, (the late) Bishop, *Words of Faith and Hope*, 459

Wirth, Dr. K. H., *Der 'Verdienst'. Begriff in der christlichen Kirche nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Parts I. II.), 207

Worledge, Rev. Canon, *Prayer*, 454

of St.
time
posed,
and
s M.
ack to
ed by
arious
of the
, 130;
start-
ought
eaning
, 133;
y side
Poeni-
; the
poeni-
nd re-
ounda-
, 137;
mbers,
l three
rapid
ociety,
ognate
d their
fluence
3; de-
Third
own as
w fea-
Rule,
rancis

N., *Is*
ature?

am of

Words

diens-
Kirche
en Ent-
07
Prayer,